

be a very good thing if we had a board or commission of some kind clothed with authority to go in and rectify the glaring modes of carrying on business for the Government, and compel them to be changed. But there is no such authority yet given to any commission or board which we have created.

THE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I have introduced a bill in this body, Senate bill 2021, which provides for the creation of a national park in California, to embrace the famous Kings River Canyon and groves of giant trees, admittedly the most surprising and wonderful stretches of the national domain, open to all the people at all seasons of the year for health, recreation, and resthetic gratification. The amendment I now move provides that this area shall be, when created into a park, designated in honor of our late and beloved President, the Roosevelt National Park. I have consulted the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Franklin K. Lane; Stephen Mather, the Superintendent of National Parks; and Representative ELSTON, of California, who are all of one mind on this subject—that no more fit designation could be made.

Theodore Roosevelt was early identified with the West, and the west of the West. He sought among the great mountain ranges and the vast expanse of the prairie a field for his abounding energy. From his narrow environment of city streets and congested population he naturally sought expansion. The liberalizing influences of the western life nationalized him and prepared him doubtless for the larger tasks which he was destined to assume. I can not imagine a more fitting memorial for a man of his character, courage, culture, generous nature, and love of the beautiful than the rugged, wild, and sublime scenery embraced in the region of central California. The story of William Tell might apply with equal pertinency to Theodore Roosevelt, who learned his love of liberty from his love of nature. He, too, was influenced by the mountain streams which "plow the valleys without asking leave" and the mountain peaks which "wear their caps of snow in the very presence of the regal sun." Here are the King and Kern River canyons, Mount Whitney, the highest in the continental United States proper, and here in the crystal-pure waters, "never too grave to smile, too tired to run," disport the golden trout, peculiar to this place alone, and already bearing the scientific description of *Salmo roosevelti*. There is no equal area on earth superior in natural wonders. It is bounded by the crests of the high Sierra; cataracts leap in glory from altitudinal clefts; giant trees lift their heads far above the besetting fog, erect amidst tempests, resplendent in the light of day, wreathed in immortelles, and serenely at rest in the free air of heaven. California—a State richly endowed by nature—can dedicate no finer monument to Roosevelt than this, the choicest of her natural gifts, nor the Nation a more appropriate memorial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

THE CENSUS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In view of the lateness of the hour I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 14, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridián.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 13, 1919.

The House, under its previous order, met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our heavenly Father, from whom proceedeth all things and to whom we are indebted for all the renewed blessings of life day by day, imbue us plenteously, we beseech Thee, with the riches of Thy grace that we may measure up to the highest aspirations of our own hearts and quit ourselves like men in the duties and responsibilities of the remaining hours of this day; and Thine be the praise through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 11, 1919, was read and approved.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for my colleague, Mr. ROUSE, on account of illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent for indefinite leave of absence for his colleague, Mr. ROUSE. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi, by unanimous consent (at request of Mr. VENABLE), was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

RATIFICATION OF PROHIBITION AMENDMENT IN MICHIGAN.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has received a communication from Gov. Sleeper, of Michigan, announcing the ratification of the prohibition amendment, which will be filed in the archives of the House.

RIVERS AND HARBORS.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw my demand for a reading of the engrossed copy of the river and harbor bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his demand for reading of the engrossed copy of the river and harbor bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a motion to recommit with directions to report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FREAR offers the following motion to recommit:

"In addition to a balance of \$45,000,000 in the hands of the Secretary of War on January 1, 1919, for immediate expenditures on river and harbor work, the sum of \$12,000,000 is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor work, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation and most economical and advantageous in the execution of the work: *Provided*, That allotments from the amount hereby appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers. *And provided further*, That at the beginning of the next session of Congress a special report shall be made to Congress by the Secretary of War showing the amount allotted under this appropriation to each work of improvement."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Is a motion to recommit subject to amendment?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I have an amendment to the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, pending the reading of the amendment, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMALL. The motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] purports to be a statement of fact regarding \$45,000,000. My inquiry is whether that is appropriate in a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think there is anything obnoxious in this motion. I will suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin—

Mr. FREAR. If there is any question—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin never made any motion at all. This is a statement.

Mr. FREAR. I move to recommit, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMALL. I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FREAR. I move to recommit.

The SPEAKER. I am stating to the gentleman that he has not moved to recommit.

Mr. FREAR. I made the motion on the floor to that extent.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman on the floor moved to recommit with instructions to report back forthwith with the amendment suggested.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, can it be reported again?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report it.

The motion to recommit was again reported.

Mr. SMALL. I move the previous question.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, if I may do so, I would like to add to that to strike out all after the enacting clause; that is, to make the motion.

The SPEAKER. What is it?

Mr. FREAR. To strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill as reported now to the House and to insert what appears here in the substitute amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FREAR moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"In addition to a balance of \$45,000,000 in the hands of the Secretary of War on January 1, 1919, for immediate expenditures in river and harbor work, the sum of \$12,000,000 is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, for the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor work and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation and most economical and advantageous in the execution of the work: *Provided*, That allotments from the amount hereby appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers: *And provided further*, That at the beginning of the next session of Congress a special report shall be made to Congress by the Secretary of War showing the amount allotted under this appropriation to each work of improvement."

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put that motion in a minute. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to amend the motion to recommit as follows: At the end of said instruction add "And said committee are further instructed"; and at the end of the bill add the following new section: "Sec. 5. The Chief of Engineers shall at the earliest date practicable report whether the various projects provided for in this bill are now deemed of urgent national importance, and no item of appropriation herein provided for shall become available until the same shall have been reported by the Chief of Engineers as of urgent national importance."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Blanton amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays, and I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. Are you going to do both things at once?

Mr. FREAR. I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin makes the point of no quorum. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 91, nays 203, answered "present" 4, not voting 132, as follows:

YEAS—91.

Anderson	Dowell	Jones	Rogers
Anthony	Elliott	Kearns	Sabath
Ayres	Ellsworth	Keating	Sanford
Baer	Emerson	King	Scott, Iowa
Beshlin	Evens	Kinkaid	Sells
Bland, Ind.	Fairfield	Knutsen	Sherwood
Blanton	Foss	Kraus	Sloan
Bowers	Foster	Lampert	Snook
Browne	Frear	McAndrews	Stafford
Campbell, Kans.	Fuller, Ill.	McCulloch	Sweet
Cary	Gallagher	McKinley	Taylor, Colo.
Chandler, Okla.	Gandy	Madden	Thompson
Clark, Pa.	Gard	Mapes	Timberlake
Claxson	Gillett	Moore, Ind.	Tinkham
Connelly, Kans.	Good	Morgan	Towner
Cooper, W. Va.	Gordon	Nelson, A. P.	Vestal
Crisp	Green, Iowa	Nelson, J. M.	Voigt
Crosser	Haugen	Norton	Welling
Currie, Mich.	Hershey	Parker, N. J.	Wheeler
Dallinger	Hilliard	Purnell	Williams
Dill	Hollingsworth	Rainey, J. W.	Wilson, Ill.
Dillon	James	Ramseyer	Young, N. Dak.
Doolittle		Rankin	

NAYS—203.

Alexander	Clark, Fla.	Doughton	Hamilton, Mich.
Almon	Claypool	Drunker	Hamlin
Aswell	Cleary	Dupré	Hardy
Austin	Coady	Dyer	Harrison, Va.
Bankhead	Collier	Elston	Haskell
Barnhart	Connally, Tex.	Ferris	Hastings
Bell	Cooper, Ohio	Fields	Hawley
Black	Cooper, Wis.	Fisher	Hayden
Blackmon	Copley	Flood	Hayes
Bland, Va.	Curry, Cal.	Fordney	Heflin
Booher	Dale	Freeman	Hensley
Browning	Darrow	French	Hicks
Buchanan	Davey	Gallivan	Holland
Burnett	Davis	Garner	Houston
Burroughs	Dempsey	Garrett, Tenn.	Huddleston
Butler	Dent	Garrett, Tex.	Hull, Iowa
Byrnes, S. C.	Denton	Glynn	Hull, Tenn.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Dewalt	Godwin, N. C.	Humphreys
Caldwell	Dickinson	Goodall	Igoe
Cannon	Dies	Goodwin, Ark.	Johnson, Ky.
Cantrill	Dixon	Gray, Ala.	Johnson, Wash.
Carew	Dominick	Greene, Mass.	Jaul
Carter, Okla.	Donovan	Greene, Vt.	Kechoe
Chandler, N. Y.	Dooling	Hadley	Kelley, Mich.

Kennedy, Iowa	Mason	Romjue	Taylor, Ark.
Kincheloc	Merritt	Rose	Temple
Kitchin	Miller, Wash.	Rubey	Tillman
La Follette	Mondell	Rucker	Tilson
La Guardia	Moon	Sanders, La.	Treadway
Larsen	Moore, Pa.	Scott, Mich.	Van Dyke
Lazaro	Mott	Sears	Venable
Lee, Cal.	Oldfield	Shallenberger	Vinson
Lee, Ga.	Oliver, Ala.	Sisson	Volstead
Lever	Olney	Slayden	Walker
Lithicum	Osborne	Small	Walton
Little	Overmyer	Smith, Idaho	Ward
Lobeck	Overstreet	Smith, T. F.	Watson
London	Padgett	Snell	Watson, Va.
Lobergan	Paige	Snyder	Weaver
Lufkin	Phelan	Steagall	Webb
Lunn	Polk	Stedman	Welty
McArthur	Pou	Steele	Whaley
McKeown	Powers	Steenerson	White, Me.
McLaughlin, Mich.	Quin	Stephens, Miss.	White, Ohio
McLaughlin, Pa.	Ragsdale	Sterling	Wilson, La.
McLemore	Rainey, H. T.	Stevenson	Wingo
Magee	Raker	Stines	Wise
Maher	Randall	Sullivan	Wood, Ind.
Mann	Riordan	Summers	Wright
Mansfield	Robbins	Switzer	Young, Tex.
Martin	Rodenberg	Tague	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Cramton Harrison, Miss. Saunders, Va. Shouse

NOT VOTING—132.

Ashbrook	Fairchild, G. W.	Kreider	Roberts
Bacharach	Farr	Langley	Robinson
Barkley	Flynn	Lehbach	Rouse
Beakes	Focht	Leshner	Rowe
Benson	Francis	Littlepage	Rowland
Birch	Fuller, Mass.	Longworth	Russell
Borland	Garland	Lundeen	Sanders, Ind.
Brand	Gould	McClintic	Sanders, N. Y.
Britten	Graham, Ill.	McCormick	Schall
Brodbeck	Graham, Pa.	McFadden	Scully
Brumbaugh	Gray, N. J.	McKenzie	Shackleford
Campbell, Pa.	Gregg	Mays	Shelley
Candler, Miss.	Griest	Miller, Minn.	Siegel
Caraway	Griffin	Montague	Sims
Carlin	Hamill	Morin	Sinnott
Carter, Mass.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Mudd	Slemp
Church	Heaton	Neely	Smith, Mich.
Costello	Heintz	Nicholls, S. C.	Smith, C. B.
Cox	Helm	Nichols, Mich.	Stephens, Nebr.
Crago	Helvering	Nolan	Strong
Decker	Hood	Oliver, N. Y.	Swift
Delaney	Howard	O'Shaunessy	Templeton
Denison	Husted	Park	Thomas
Doremus	Hutchinson	Parker, N. Y.	Vare
Drane	Ireland	Peters	Waldow
Dunn	Jacoway	Platt	Walsh
Egan	Johnson, S. Dak.	Porter	Watkins
Eagle	Kahn	Pratt	Watson, Pa.
Edmonds	Kelly, Pa.	Price	Wilson, Tex.
Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsay	Winslow
Essen	Kettner	Rayburn	Woods, Iowa
Estopinal	Key, Ohio	Reavis	Woodyard
Fairchild, B. L.	Kiess, Pa.	Reed	Zihlman

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. SHOUSE (for) with Mr. SCULLY (against).

Mr. CRAMTON (for) with Mr. EDMONDS (against).

Mr. MCCLINTIC (for) with Mr. ROWE (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. SIMS with Mr. ESCH.

Mr. ROUSE with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. SIEGEL.

Mr. PARK with Mr. SWIFT.

Mr. DELANEY with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. BRAND with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. REAVIS.

Mr. HELM with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. WALSH.

Mr. THOMAS with Mr. FARR.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. LEHLBACH.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. SINNOTT.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. HUTCHINSON.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan.

Mr. BEAKES with Mr. REED.

Mr. HELVERING with Mr. GARLAND.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. GOULD.

Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. DENISON.

Mr. OLIVER of New York with Mr. STRONG.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. VARE.

Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. ZIHLMAN.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I voted "yea." I would like to withdraw my vote and to vote "present," because I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. EDMONDS.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The motion to recommit is lost. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SMALL and Mr. FREAR demanded the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 234, nays 70, answered "present" 5, not voting 121, as follows:

YEAS—234.

Alexander	Ellsworth	Larson	Sanders, La.
Almon	Elston	Lazaro	Sanders, N. Y.
Anderson	Farr	Lea, Cal.	Sanford
Aswell	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Schall
Austin	Fisher	Lever	Scott, Mich.
Bankhead	Flood	Litchcum	Sears
Beakes	Fordney	Little	Shallenberger
Bell	Foss	Lobeck	Sinnott
Black	Freeman	London	Slayden
Blackmon	French	Louergan	Sloan
Bland, Va.	Fuller, Ill.	Longworth	Small
Booher	Gard	Lufkin	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Garner	Lunn	Smith, C. B.
Browning	Garrett, Tenn.	McArthur	Smith, T. F.
Buchanan	Garrett, Tex.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snel
Burnett	Glynn	McLaughlin, Pa.	Snyder
Burroughs	Godwin, N. C.	McLamore	Stogall
Butler	Goodall	Magee	Stodman
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	Maher	Steenerson
Byrns, Tenn.	Gray, Ala.	Mann	Stephens, Miss.
Caldwell	Greene, Mass.	Mansfield	Stephens, Nebr.
Cannon	Greene, Vt.	Martin	Sterling
Cantrill	Hadley	Mason	Stevenson
Caraway	Hamilton, Mich.	Merritt	Stiness
Carew	Hanlin	Miller, Wash.	Sullivan
Carter, Okla.	Hardy	Mondell	Switzer
Chandler, N. Y.	Harrison, Va.	Moon	Tague
Clark, Fla.	Haskell	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Ark.
Clark, Pa.	Hastings	Morgan	Temple
Claypool	Hawley	Mott	Tillman
Cleary	Hayden	Oldfield	Tilson
Coady	Hayes	Oliver, Ala.	Timberlake
Collier	Heflin	Olney	Tinkham
Connally, Tex.	Hensley	Osborne	Treadway
Cooper, Ohio	Hicks	Overmyer	Van Dyke
Cooper, W. Va.	Hilliard	Overstreet	Venable
Cooper, Wis.	Holland	Padgett	Vinson
Copley	Hollingsworth	Paige	Volstead
Curry, Cal.	Houston	Parker, N. J.	Walker
Dale	Huddleston	Phelan	Walton
Darrow	Hull, Iowa	Polk	Ward
Davey	Hull, Tenn.	Porter	Watson
Davis	Humphreys	Pou	Watkins
Dempsey	Igoe	Powers	Watson, Va.
Denison	Jacoway	Quin	Weaver
Dent	Johnson, Ky.	Ragsdale	Webb
Denton	Johnson, Wash.	Rafney, H. T.	Welling
Dewalt	Jones	Raker	Welty
Dickinson	Juil	Randall	Whaley
Dies	Kearns	Rankin	White, Me.
Dill	Kehoe	Rayburn	Wilson, La.
Dixon	Kelley, Mich.	Riordan	Wingo
Dominick	Kennedy, Iowa.	Robbins	Wise
Donovan	Key, Ohio	Rodenberg	Wood, Ind.
Doolling	Kincheloe	Rozers	Woodyard
Doughton	Kinkaid	Romjue	Wright
Drukker	Kitchin	Rose	Young, Tex.
Dupré	La Follette	Rubey	
Dyer	LaGuardia	Rucker	

NAYS—70.

Anthony	Doolittle	Keating	Ramseyer
Ayres	Dowell	Kelly, Pa.	Sabath
Baer	Elliott	King	Scott, Iowa
Barnhart	Emerson	Kraus	Sells
Beshlin	Evans	Lampert	Sherwood
Bland, Ind.	Fairfield	McAndrews	Snook
Blanton	Fess	McCulloch	Stafford
Browne	Foster	McKeown	Taylor, Colo.
Campbell, Kans.	Frear	McKinley	Thompson
Cary	Gallagher	Madden	Towner
Chandler, Okla.	Gallivan	Mapes	Vestal
Classon	Gandy	Moore, Ind.	Voigt
Connelly, Kans.	Good	Nelson, A. P.	Wheeler
Crisp	Gordon	Nelson, J. M.	Williams
Crosser	Green, Iowa	Nolan	Wilson, Ill.
Currie, Mich.	Haugen	Norton	Young, N. Dak.
Dallinger	Hersey	Purnell	
Dillon	James	Rafney, J. W.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—5.

Cramton	Knutson	Saunders, Va.	Shouse
Harrison, Miss.			

NOT VOTING—121.

Ashbrook	Carter, Mass.	Fisch	Graham, Ill.
Bacharach	Church	Essen	Graham, Pa.
Barkley	Costello	Estopinal	Gray, N. J.
Benson	Cox	Fairchild, B. L.	Gregg
Birch	Crago	Fairchild, G. W.	Griest
Borland	Decker	Ferris	Griffin
Brand	Delaney	Flynn	Hamill
Britten	Doremus	Focht	Hamilton, N. Y.
Brodbeck	Drane	Francis	Heaton
Brumbaugh	Dunn	Fuller, Mass.	Heintz
Campbell, Pa.	Eagan	Garland	Helm
Candler, Miss.	Eagle	Gillett	Heuvering
Carlin	Edmonds	Gould	Hoed

Howard	McFadden	Ramsey	Smith, Mich.
Husted	McKenzie	Reavis	Steele
Hutchinson	Mays	Reed	Strong
Ireland	Miller, Minn.	Roberts	Summers
Johnson, S. Dak.	Montague	Robinson	Sweet
Kahn	Morin	Rouse	Swift
Kennedy, R. I.	Mudd	Rowe	Templeton
Kettner	Neely	Rowland	Thomas
Kiess, Pa.	Nicholls, S. C.	Russell	Vare
Kreider	Nichols, Mich.	Sanders, Ind.	Waldow
Langley	Oliver, N. Y.	Scully	Walsh
Lehbach	O'Shaunessy	Shackelford	Watson, Pa.
Leshar	Park	Sherley	White, Ohio
Littlepage	Parker, N. Y.	Siegel	Wilson, Tex.
Lundeen	Peters	Sims	Winslow
McClintic	Platt	Sisson	Woods, Iowa
McCormick	Price	Slemp	Zihlman

So the bill was passed. The Clerk announced the following additional pairs: Mr. ROWE (for) with Mr. McCLINTIC (against). Mr. EDMONDS (for) with Mr. CRAMTON (against). Mr. SCULLY (for) with Mr. SHOUSE (against). Mr. COSTELLO (for) with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania (against). Mr. VARE (for) with Mr. ROWLAND (against).

Until further notice: Mr. GREEST with Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. BENSON with Mr. FOCHT. Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. BRITTON. Mr. HELM with Mr. IRELAND. Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on the vote just taken I am recorded in the affirmative. I forgot that I was paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH. I wish to withdraw that vote and to vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to recommit I voted "no" inadvertently, forgetting that I was paired with the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. REAVIS. I desire to withdraw my vote, and I ask unanimous consent to do so. The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks to withdraw his vote and to be recorded as present. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I wish to make the same request. I was paired with the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH. I thought he was back here, and inadvertently voted. The SPEAKER. The gentleman makes the same request. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection. Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I came into the room hurriedly from a committee meeting, misunderstood the motion to recommit, and voted "no." I should like to ask unanimous consent to change my vote from no to aye. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] asks unanimous consent to change his vote from no to aye on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am not very distinct in my memory. Does the Speaker remember when last a request of this kind was made and Members were allowed to change their votes in this way? The SPEAKER. The recollection of the Chair is that it has been done once or twice, and it has been objected to sometimes. The Chair will give his opinion that it is a very poor practice.

Mr. MANN. The statement is already in the Record. The SPEAKER. Is there objection? Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask that the vote on the bill be again reported. The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is trying to change his vote on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the one I desire to know about. The SPEAKER. Ninety-one ayes and 103 noes. That is on the motion to recommit. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is that the vote that the gentleman desires to change his vote upon? The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to break any precedent. It is not very material, and I withdraw my request. On motion of Mr. SMALL, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table. Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is not here, and he asked me to announce that were he here he would vote against the motion to recommit and in favor of the passage of the bill.

BATTLE MOUNTAIN SANITARIUM.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 13440 transferring jurisdiction and control over Battle Mountain Sanitarium of the

National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers from the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the Secretary of War for use for Army hospital purposes for the period covered by the exigencies growing out of the present war.

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman make some statement.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title to the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13440) transferring jurisdiction and control over Battle Mountain Sanitarium of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers from the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the Secretary of War for use for Army hospital purposes for the period covered by the exigencies growing out of the present war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. SLOAN. I object.

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman from Nebraska withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. SLOAN. I will, but I shall object if no one else does.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, this is a Government institution and the national board of control has signified in writing their consent for its transfer to the Surgeon General, who needs it for hospital purposes. It was built for a hospital, it is a hospital, and the Surgeon General's office needs it to take care of the returned wounded soldiers from over the seas.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is it to be open to discharged soldiers or only to those who are returned and retained in the service?

Mr. GANDY. To take care of wounded soldiers in the service. I may say that there are only 230 inmates there now, and there are 1,000 vacant beds in the home at Danville. It is proposed to take the members from this sanitarium to Danville for the time being.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SLOAN. I object.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. EAGAN, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for three days on account of sickness.

INVESTIGATION OF LIGNITE.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3220, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3220, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. The Clerk will report the title to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products.

RELIEF IN EUROPE.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I submit the following resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 499 (H. Rept. No. 915).

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 13708 (a bill providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary); that there shall be not exceeding three and one-quarter hours of general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, to be divided equally between those supporting and those opposing the bill, and to be controlled equally by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], at the end of which time the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule, and at the conclusion of such reading the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House, together with the amendments, if any, whereupon the previous question shall be considered as ordered upon the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the rule be 80 minutes, 40 minutes to be controlled by myself and 40 minutes by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. At the end of which time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this rule be confined to 80 minutes, half to be controlled by himself and half controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]; that at the end of 80 minutes the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman a question. The rule provides for three and a quar-

ter hours of debate on the bill. On the rule would be 80 minutes additional, which would make in the neighborhood of five hours before it is completed. Then it would be considered under the five-minute rule. Is it the intention of the gentleman from Kentucky, if the gentleman from North Carolina knows, to ask the House to stay in session to-day until the bill is completed?

Mr. POU. I think that is the intention of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will pardon me, I will say that that was my desire, and I presumed it would be the desire of the House. The days are passing, and if everyone knew the matter was to be disposed of to-day there would be an assurance of the full attendance which the importance of the matter demands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the gentleman, as there is some ambiguity in the phrase, whether it is the intention of the committee, or of the two gentlemen named, to control the time both in favor and against, or is one to control the time entirely in opposition and the other entirely in favor of the bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. It was my understanding that the gentleman from Massachusetts would control the time in opposition. I would control the time in favor of the bill, and it is my purpose to give to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] practically one-half of my time for such use as he may see fit to make of it on his side of the House for those who favor the proposal.

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the chairman. I could not hear everything that was said, but do I understand that his request would prevent the offering of amendments?

Mr. POU. No.

Mr. MANN. It would prevent an amendment to the rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL].

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order a bill from the Committee on Appropriations which appropriates \$100,000,000 to relieve famine conditions in Europe. There was no objection in the Committee on Rules to the form of the rule. The Committee on Rules is unanimous, I believe, in the opinion that the terms of the rule are entirely fair, and there was no criticism as to the rule itself. There was, however, in the Committee on Rules, determined opposition to the bill which the rule seeks to make in order, and I would like to have the House know that the Committee on Appropriations, one of the most conservative and careful committees of the House, after a full consideration, made a favorable report upon the bill appropriating \$100,000,000; and the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], appeared before the Committee on Rules, in behalf of his committee, asking for the adoption of this rule.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. I have very little time, but I will yield for a very brief question.

Mr. GORDON. Just a question to ask the gentleman what the vote was in the Committee on Appropriations, that great, conservative committee?

Mr. CANTRILL. All that I know is that it was a majority vote, which is sufficient to bring the matter before the House and before the Committee on Rules. If it had not been a majority vote, of course the chairman of that committee would not have come before the Committee on Rules.

The facts are these, as we understand them on the record that has been made before the Committee on Rules: There are thousands and tens of thousands of people in Europe who today are starving to death. It comes to us from the best of authority that within the next two or three months there will be millions of people in Europe starving, and the Governments of England and France and Italy have already appointed their commissions and put behind them financial support, and to-day, are relieving as best they can famine conditions in Europe. This Government, through the President of the United States, has called upon Congress and the American people to cooperate with these European Governments in helping to relieve these famine conditions. I appeal to this House, and especially to the Republican side of the House, to repudiate the action of the gentlemen of the Committee on Rules representing that side of the House when they undertake to say to the peoples of the world that the United States are so stingy and so devoid of all principles of humanity and Christianity that they will not cooperate with other Governments in saving mil-

lions of starving women and children in this world. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. No; I have not the time. I have only a few minutes, as the gentleman knows. That is the situation that is before us; and the eyes of the world and the eyes of the people of this Nation are looking at this House to-day to see whether or not we are willing, out of our abundance and plenty, the American people and this Government, the richest in all the world, after having appropriated money by the billions for war munitions with which to kill people, whether now we are willing to place ourselves in the attitude of refusing to appropriate a paltry \$100,000,000 in order to cooperate with the great civilized nations of France, Italy, and England to save millions of women and children from starving to death. The great God of the universe has blessed this country more than any other in the history of the world, and do you gentlemen mean to tell me that upon a great occasion like this you intend to draw political and party lines upon the question of millions of people starving to death?

Yet this House to-day is confronted with the spectacle of gentlemen on the Committee on Rules representing the Republican side of the House voting against supporting the rule when the Committee on Appropriations had already passed favorably upon it. Gentlemen on the Republican side of the House, I ask you to repudiate that action. If you are not in favor of the bill, I do beg you, in the name of humanity, with millions of people starving to death, to at least adopt the rule and bring the bill before the House, where it may be considered upon its merits, so that the American people may know the real condition that exists in Europe to-day. [Applause.] One of the most distinguished American women has recently come back, after giving her services to the Red Cross, and she delivered a lecture in this city the other day. Speaking from actual observation she said that in many places in Europe to-day mothers having three or four or five children are now compelled to pick the child that they will permit to die, because they can not get food enough to feed them all. Yet do you gentlemen on the Republican side of the House mean to tell me that in such conditions as that you propose to have the party lash applied to you and refuse to adopt this rule, so that you may have the opportunity of hearing the bill upon its merits? The facts are as we get them from the very best of authority, that the appropriation of this paltry sum will relieve conditions—and it is a paltry sum compared with the billions that we have appropriated without a dissenting voice in recent days. It is a fact that this appropriation will do more to satisfy European countries that this Nation is sincere in its demand for peace than anything else we can do. When people are starving you can not ask them to give favorable consideration to any peace terms or to any terms that would help reestablish law and order. The first thoughts of people who are starving turn to anarchy, and in large measure, in my opinion, the great turmoil that is existing in Europe to-day is due more to famine than to any other one condition, and yet when we are asked to cooperate, not to assume the entire burden ourselves, with these other great Governments, whose commissions have already been appointed, and I believe Lord Reading has been appointed as the head of the English commission—when we are asked to appropriate this money we find bitter opposition, and I say all honor and glory to the Committee on Appropriations of this House for favorably voting upon it, including the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], the father of the House, in whom every Member has implicit confidence. There was no politics in it, as I understand it, in the Committee on Appropriations, because the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is heartily in favor of the bill, and I am asking you to adopt the rule in order that you gentlemen upon the Republican side of the House may hear him speak upon the merits of the proposition, and I am sure that you gentlemen have unlimited confidence in his judgment, especially on matters of this character. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is presented by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, if adopted by this House to-day, makes in order the boldest piece of legislation that has been introduced in the Sixty-fifth Congress. This legislation contemplated by this bill will open up a brand new field of limitless public expenditure, and it is of such a character that it demands the most careful and considerate attention by every Member of the House. During the last two or three years we have become accustomed to pass appropriations of \$1,000,000, \$2,000,000, \$100,000,000—yes, five and ten billions of dollars—at one time, with hardly any debate, with scarcely the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

But, mind you, gentlemen, we did that because the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army, said that it was absolutely necessary for the prosecution of the war. When we received those commands, Republicans and Democrats alike stood shoulder to shoulder, rose to the situation, and almost unanimously voted President Wilson more money and more power than that which has been granted to any king or potentate in the history of the civilized world. But we did that to win the war. Now, thank God, the war is over and an entirely different situation confronts us. Let me tell you, gentlemen of the House, the day has gone by when you can hold a man up to public ridicule, call him un-American, unpatriotic, and pro-German because he demands full information [applause on the Republican side] before he votes to give away the people's money. That is the reason I am opposed to this rule and this bill here to-day. The information is not available to this House why we should grant Mr. Wilson and Mr. Hoover this new, additional, and unlimited authority. Mr. Speaker, because we granted President Wilson's every request to win the war, that is no sign we will follow him blindfolded in reconstructing the Old World. The financial conditions of this country at the present are such that the American people demand that this Congress shall closely scrutinize every dollar of public expenditure. They demand that we shall not appropriate a dollar of public money that is not absolutely needed, and every man in this House knows that the business of this country will fairly groan under the taxes that will be levied by the present pending revenue bill; and the worst of it all is the end is not yet in sight. I was told by a member of the Committee on Ways and Means this morning that there would be a deficit in the public funds this year of \$10,000,000,000. A \$5,000,000,000 loan will come this spring and another later in the season.

Now, with these financial conditions confronting us, I maintain that there are no \$100,000,000 plums for any one man's basket, unless we have the most positive and definite information as to the absolute necessity, the how, where, and why it will be spent, and that information is not available at the present time. Mr. Speaker, if I can read the signs of the times, there is more unrest, uncertainty, and, I think I may say, discontent, among the laboring population, the manufacturer, the farmer, and business men to-day than at any time in recent years. High taxation and higher cost of living are causing the spread of Bolshevism in our own country, and, notwithstanding this, the President demands that we place a \$100,000,000 additional tax on our people, that, as he says, Mr. Hoover may stop the spread of Bolshevism and anarchy in a foreign land. The time has come, gentlemen, when the President of the United States and the Members of this Congress should give more attention to the reconstruction problems here at home and less to the political intrigues of map-making of southern Europe. [Applause on the Republican side.] I am not opposed to rendering relief to the stricken and starving populations of the Old World. I will go just as far as any man in private or public expenditure along this line, but I do maintain that the time has come, if we are going to open up a new field for public expenditures of this kind, that President Wilson should tell the Congress and the American people what he intends to do and how far he is going along this line. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Just a minute more.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. And I also maintain that the time has come when, to a certain extent at least, he should take us into his confidence in regard to his reconstruction and peace plans, and until he does that and until he does furnish us the information to which we are entitled I maintain it is the duty of every man in this House to vote against these questionable lump-sum appropriations. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield back any time he did not use?

Mr. SNELL. I yield back whatever time may be remaining.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back half a minute.

Mr. POU. Will the gentleman use some more of his time?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I would like the gentleman from North Carolina to use some more of his time.

Mr. POU. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill. [Applause.] Let us stop a minute and see what is involved. There is no time in the short debate to show what the merits of this proposition are. This proposition is to consider this bill, and I want to ask this side of the House and that side of the House, Are you afraid to consider this bill upon its merits? [Applause.] The only way to get intelligent consideration is to consider it.

So much for that. Oh, I have here a letter written by President Roosevelt, a message, just as the ships went around the world, in regard to the great earthquake in Italy and the \$800,000 which he asked of the Congress, and it was given without a word, and when it was given he expended it for food. The returning eight battleships and other ships were sent to help relieve the condition. They were fed. It was in time of peace. He was a great statesman, and he was broad enough to understand that in this country is the great melting pot, and it was put upon that ground as well as to relieve misfortune. And after he fed them he built houses over there from that appropriation, and it met with the approval of this country. A score or more of similar appropriations have been made. Now, what is the condition, just briefly, and all I can do is to refer to it? Outside of the allies the Bolsheviki are in possession everywhere in Europe except Germany, and making great headway there. Oh, perhaps, not in Finland.

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will be brief.

Mr. SLOAN. Did ex-President Roosevelt ask to have personal charge of that \$800,000 appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; it was expended under his direction.

Mr. SLOAN. That he should have personal charge of it?

Mr. CANNON. Well, he did have personal charge of it. How else could you expend it? [Applause.] I simply refer to it in passing. Great God, I think I have got in my make-up a strain of German, a strain of English, a strain of Irish, and a strain of French. [Laughter and applause.] God made the world, and under God we have had the progress we have had. Now, at the end of this great contest what have you? A peace table. Who is at the table? Germany? No. Germany is fighting as to whether she will go absolutely to the Bolsheviki, which means anarchy there. Austria? No. Russia? No. The Balkans? No; unless it be Serbia that will get in. There you are. What security have you as to who you are to negotiate with for peace? Now, it is put upon this ground as a matter of policy. First, it is good policy that people should not starve, for if they are starving they will take food with a strong hand. Why, God knows there is not a man within the sound of my voice, if there was anarchy in the United States as they have it in Europe outside of the allies, and food was short—there is not a man in this House of Representatives, if his family was starving and he was starving, but would take it with a strong hand if it could be found. If there is one such, let him rise up now. [Applause.]

No man rises on either side of the House.

This is to relieve a condition; and yet gentlemen say that they will not even consider this proposition. I do not indorse lots of things that Woodrow Wilson has done; but he is our President. Right or wrong, he is over there trying to do things.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. Our expenditures during this war were \$40,000,000 per day. This \$100,000,000 would amount to the expenditures for two days and a half, where we have expended very well up toward \$30,000,000,000, and, God knows, when the end comes and we have peace, after all things are determined, war risks and everything else, it may amount to \$50,000,000,000 or \$60,000,000,000.

We have the food; we can demonstrate that. We have the wheat that the Government owns. We have an excess of pork and fats and cottonseed oil and lard oil. This money will be expended in this country, substantially. From the standpoint of a wise policy, without any indorsement of Woodrow Wilson, except as it is necessary to recognize that he is our President and will be for two years to come—the only President we have—we ought not to withhold proper aid to work out these problems. In the event this rule is adopted I will speak a little more at length and give reasons why, in my judgment, this bill should pass. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Illinois use his entire time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He used all of his time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD], a member of the Committee on Appropriations. [Applause.]

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I opposed this bill in the committee and I oppose it now. However, I did say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that I would do what I could to have the bill brought before the House, and what I have to say, therefore, is not in opposition to the rule, because I realized that the merits of this

proposition could not be discussed in 80 minutes, but will in part explain my opposition to the bill itself.

But a few weeks remain of this Sixty-fifth Congress. This Congress will go down in history as the greatest legislative assembly in all the world. It passed more important legislation, appropriated more money, did more real substantial work than any other legislative body in the world. And it all was done with a singleness of purpose and a patriotism that touched every Member of the House. We were in favor of winning the war, and we voted without party division to give the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, all the power and all the money necessary to win imperishable glory for our country and our country's flag. But, Mr. Speaker, when on the 11th day of last November the President appeared in our presence and read that most remarkable message, giving in detail the terms of the armistice, he concluded by saying:

The war thus comes to an end; for, having accepted these terms of armistice, it will be impossible for the German command to renew it.

I approach, therefore, the discussion of this subject on the solemn declaration of the President that two months ago the war came to an end and that Germany would be unable to renew it. When the war was on we gave him all the money he asked for its prosecution; we gave him all the power, all the legislation which he demanded to win the war. Now that the war is over, I believe that Congress, one of the coordinate branches of the Government, should again commence to function; that it should pass upon all demands; and that the House of Representatives, which is entrusted under the Constitution with originating all appropriation bills, shall before it passes appropriation bills know the details not only with regard to the needs for which the appropriations are asked but the conditions under which the appropriations are to be expended. Now that the war is over, I am not willing to pass lump-sum appropriation bills to carry out objects, no matter how worthy, unless we understand all the facts. Of course, there is starvation in Europe; there always has been, there always will be, and I am willing to go as far as any man to give relief to the needy and the suffering. If we would rise to our full duty in such an emergency we would not pass a lump-sum appropriation, much of which might be wasted in its administration. But if the emergency is urgent we would give to the American Red Cross, that great mother of humanity, composed as it is of more than 22,000,000 Americans, who are contributing to its objects—we would delegate to that organization, with more than 5,000 relief commissioners in Europe, the task of bringing relief; we would give them more than our full share of the funds necessary to prevent suffering and starvation. I am not in favor of this bill, which, if enacted into law, will, I fear, be the first step which we will have taken since war came to an end to invite extravagance and waste in the expenditure of public funds.

I do not object to appropriating this money because it is granted to the President. I am opposed to appropriating any lump sum, giving any individual, no matter who he is, full power and discretion over its expenditure. By the very nature of things, the President, because of his multitudinous duties, can not investigate the expenditure of such vast sums that have been entrusted to his care. He has been compelled to turn these matters over to subordinates and bureau chiefs. When the history of this war is written men will be shocked to learn how hundreds of millions of dollars were utterly wasted, and most of the waste came through lump-sum appropriations. Now that the war is over, we should profit by our experiences during the war and appropriate money only when we know all the facts for which the appropriation is sought, and we should make detailed appropriation in a manner so that the fund can not be spent for any other object than that for which it was expressly appropriated.

I think I can define my position best by relating here what has already been done in what I believe to be an illegal appropriation by the President of \$5,000,000 out of the funds granted to the President for national security and defense.

I have here a statement from the War Trade Board for publication on December 15, 1918, which reads:

The loading of two additional vessels with cargoes for Russia and arrangements for continued shipments through January and February through the activity of the War Trade Board of the United States Russian Bureau (Inc.) was announced to-day by the War Trade Board. The dispatch of three vessels to Vladivostok carrying materials urgently needed in Siberia previously was announced.

Private capital, acting on information furnished through the Russian bureau, is financing most of these cargoes, which include also materials for Czecho-Slovak relief and railroad materials. This is in harmony with the announced policy of the board to encourage and promote the rehabilitation of Russia's economic life and to cover by direct operations only those portions of the field which can not be served readily by private enterprise. Plans for shipments to Vladivostok, Black Sea, and the Baltic were considered by the board at its meeting to-day.

When my attention was called to this work of the War Trade Board of the United States Russian Bureau (Inc.), I commenced

a search to ascertain if Congress had authorized its incorporation. I found no such record. I found that Vance McCormick and a majority of the members of the War Trade Board had incorporated under the title "The War Trade Board of United States Russian Bureau (Inc.)," and that Vance McCormick was president, and John Foster Dulles, nephew of Secretary Lansing, was the secretary and treasurer. This concern was incorporated under the laws of the State of Connecticut. The certificate of incorporation provides "that the amount of capital stock with which this corporation shall commence business is \$5,000,000." The incorporators, with their holdings of stock, are as follows: Vance McCormick, 1 share; J. Beaver White, 1 share; Edwin F. Gay, 1 share; Clarence M. Woolley, 1 share; Albert Strauss, 1 share; Alonzo E. Taylor, 1 share; Thomas L. Chadbourne, jr., 1 share; H. Starr Giddings, 1 share; Stoddard M. Stevens, jr., 1 share; Ralph Royall, 1 share; and Vance C. McCormick, chairman of the War Trade Board, 49,990 shares. It is thus seen that these incorporators include a majority of the directors of the War Trade Board, and that each incorporator subscribed for only 1 share of stock, but that the remaining 49,990 shares are held by Mr. Vance C. McCormick as chairman of the War Trade Board. The \$5,000,000, I am advised by the War Trade Board, was contributed by the President out of the \$100,000,000 which Congress appropriated to him in a lump sum for national security and defense. It is therefore apparent that this incorporation to which I have referred is a United States corporation. The United States really owns all of the stock, and on inquiry I find that it is through this corporation that the United States proposes to deal with the Russian situation.

I am advised that it will take many millions more to carry out the intentions of the department, and I undertake to say that if anything at all is done along the line provided for in the charter of this corporation the amount involved will reach billions of dollars.

While we were willing to vote and did vote without party division billions of dollars to prosecute the war, and I believe now are willing to vote millions of dollars to relieve distress, suffering, and starvation in Europe, yet I want to say that I do not believe there is a man here who down in his heart would be willing to vote one dollar out of the Treasury to carry out the provisions found in this certificate of incorporation, wherein are enumerated all the objects of the corporation.

Would you be willing to give to the President \$5,000,000 to organize a company to engage in the manufacture of all kinds of products in any and all parts of the world, to prospect for minerals and metals and mine them, or to buy agricultural, grazing, and timber lands in all parts of the world, or to buy precious stones, or to buy, build, own, and manage hotels, boarding houses, and restaurants in all parts of the world outside of the State of Connecticut, or to buy and operate railroads in all parts of the world outside of the State of Connecticut, or to loan money in all parts of the world outside of the State of Connecticut, or to carry on the business of banking in all parts of the world outside of the State of Connecticut? No; of course, you would not; and yet, out of the \$100,000,000 that was given to the President by Congress to carry on the war, he has given \$5,000,000 to this corporation which is empowered to do all these things, and many other things.

I have read the wonderful dream of Cecil Rhodes. I have read with interest and enthusiasm the charter of the Hudson Bay Co., but I undertake to say here and now that the dream of Cecil Rhodes or the charter of the Hudson Bay Co. is not to be compared with this wonderful document setting forth the aims and purposes of the War Trade Board of United States Russian Bureau (Inc.).

I will append to my remarks the certificate of organization, but the certificate of incorporation is so illuminating that I shall read it for your information, in order that you may see the objects to which the President has set aside \$5,000,000 appropriated to him in a lump sum for national security and defense.

It is as follows:

Certificate of incorporation of the War Trade Board of United States Russian Bureau (Inc.).

We, the subscribers, certify that we do hereby associate ourselves as a body politic and corporate under the statute laws of the State of Connecticut, and we further certify—

First. That the name of the corporation is the War Trade Board of United States Russian Bureau (Inc.).

Second. That the said corporation is to be located in the town of Hartford, County of Hartford, State of Connecticut.

Third. That the nature of the business to be transacted and the purposes to be promoted or carried out by said corporation are as follows:

1. To engage in the business of buying, selling, importing, and exporting goods, wares, and merchandise of every description, and any and all kinds of personal property, and to carry on a general mercantile and commercial business in any part of the world.

2. To engage in any and all kinds of manufacturing, and to acquire, hold, lease, and sell all lands, buildings, machinery, and equipment, and all raw materials and supplies necessary to or useful in the conduct of any such business in any part of the world.

3. To search for, prospect, explore, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, own, develop, work, operate, sell, lease, mortgage, or otherwise dispose of any and all agricultural, grazing, timber, or other lands, mineral deposits, mines, mining properties, collieries, and quarries, and the products and by-products thereof, all in any part of the world.

4. To cultivate, cut, mine, crush, smelt, concentrate, refine, treat, prepare for market, buy, sell, exchange, export, import, trade and deal in any and all agricultural products, timber, and timber products, oil, petroleum, coal, iron, metals, phosphates, nitrates, minerals, precious stones, and materials and products and by-products of all kinds, all in any part of the world.

All of this under the guise of feeding the starving people of Russia. Further:

5. To build, construct, complete, equip, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, hold, own, manage, operate, maintain, mortgage, sell, or otherwise dispose of hotels, apartment houses, boarding and lodging houses, restaurants, stores, shops, and places of public entertainment or amusement, all in any part of the world, outside of the State of Connecticut.

[Laughter.]

What is the matter with Connecticut?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. No; I regret I can not. I have not the time—

6. To build, construct, complete, equip, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, hold, own, manage, operate, maintain, mortgage, sell or otherwise dispose of railways, telephone and telegraph systems, gas and electric light and power works, plants and systems, and any other plants, machinery or works for the production, manufacture, transmission and distribution of light or energy of every nature and description, and to furnish and sell gas, electricity, steam and any other kind of substance or energy used for lighting, heating, or power purposes, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

[Laughter.]

7. To build, construct, complete, equip, purchase, lease or otherwise acquire, hold, own, maintain, operate, mortgage, sell, or otherwise dispose of, or turn to account, reservoirs, water powers, dams, flumes, watercourses, aqueducts, water rights, canals, irrigation systems, sewage, drainage and sanitary works, water works and to furnish and sell water and water power, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

8. To promote, finance, build, construct, complete, equip, purchase, lease, or otherwise acquire, hold, own, operate, maintain, mortgage, sell, or otherwise dispose of wharves, piers, docks, bulkheads, dry-docks, basins, tugs, floats, lighters, storehouses, warehouses, elevators, oil tanks, and other terminal facilities of all kinds, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

9. To build, equip, buy, own, lease, operate, and sell steamships, sailing vessels and any and all other kinds of craft or instrumentalities used or to be used in the business of transporting freight or passengers upon water; and in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut to operate the same, and engage in the transportation of or in the business of transporting freight or passengers.

10. To take and receive upon deposit, as bailee, for safekeeping and storage, jewelry, plate, money, specie, bullion, stocks, bonds, securities, and valuable papers of any kind, and other valuable personal property, and to guarantee their safety, upon such terms and for such compensation as may be agreed upon by it and the respective bailors thereof, and to let out vaults, safes, and other receptacles, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

11. To make loans or advances, either ordinary or privileged, either with or without security, at such rates of interest as may be agreed upon between the corporation and the borrower, either for ordinary banking or commercial purposes or for the special purpose of facilitating mining, agricultural, and industrial operations and public utilities, all in any part of the world outside of the State of Connecticut.

Now, get this, my Democratic friends, and never again refer to trusts or illegal combinations:

16. To enter into any agreement or arrangement for sharing profits, union of interest, reciprocal concessions or cooperations, with any country, firm, or person carrying on or proposing to carry on any business within or similar to any of the objects of this company; to guarantee the contracts and obligations of any such company, firm, or person; to unite with any such company, firm, or person in the creation of joint or joint and several obligations of any and every character which this company may find it necessary or convenient to create, or issue in the execution of any business or the carrying out of any purpose specified in this certificate; but none of the business authorized by this paragraph shall be done within the State of Connecticut.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Vance McCormick has provided here for the greatest trust the world ever saw and it is financed out of the \$100,000,000 given to the President for national security and defense, and all of it is done under the cover of feeding the starving people of Russia.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. No; I can not yield.

17. To acquire in any manner, hold, and own bonds, debentures, or other obligations, or evidences of indebtedness or securities, or shares of capital stock in any corporation or corporations, association or associations, and while owner thereof to exercise the rights, powers, and privileges of ownership, including the right to vote on any shares of stock or in respect of any bonds or debentures so held or owned.

18. To carry on the business of banking in all its branches, and to transact and do all matters and things incidental thereto, or which may be usual in connection with the business of banking or dealing in money or securities for money, including, among other things, the issue of due bills, circulating notes to bearer, bank notes, promissory notes, or the discounting and negotiating, buying, selling, paying, or collecting of promissory notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and other evidences of indebtedness; receiving deposits, buying and selling ex-

change, bank notes, bullion, and coin, and loaning money on real and personal security, but no part of the business specified in this paragraph shall be done in the State of Connecticut.

Think of it! The President giving Mr. Vance McCormick's private corporation, even though the stock is held by the War Trade Board, \$5,000,000 to carry on banking in any part of the world, with power to issue due bills, circulating notes to bearer, bank notes, etc., all to prevent the people of Russia from starving.

19. The corporation shall have power to do any and all things set forth as its objects to the same extent and as fully as a natural person might or could do, as principal, agent, contractor, or otherwise, and by or through trustees, agents, subcontractors, or otherwise, alone or jointly with any other corporation, association, firm, or person, and to execute all acts and enter into all contracts, civil and mercantile, and to do all and everything necessary or incidental for the protection or benefit of the corporation: *Provided, however*, That this corporation shall not have power to transact, within the State of Connecticut, the business of a bank, savings bank, trust company, building and loan association, insurance company, surety or indemnity company, railroad or street railway company, telegraph or telephone company, gas, electric-light or water company, or the business of a company requiring the right to take and condemn lands within the said State, or to occupy the public highways within said State; and nothing herein contained shall be construed to permit the doing of any acts within the said State not authorized in the case of a corporation organized under the general laws thereof, nor permit the doing of any acts in any other State or Territory of the United States, or in any foreign country, if prohibited by the laws of such State, Territory, or foreign country: *And provided further*, That within the State of Connecticut this corporation shall not have the power to and shall not sell or negotiate its own choses in action, nor sell, guarantee, nor negotiate the choses in action of any other person or corporations as investments.

Fourth. That the amount of the capital stock of said corporation hereby authorized is \$5,000,000, divided into 50,000 shares of the par value of \$100 each, all of one class.

Fifth. That the amount of capital stock with which this corporation shall commence business is \$5,000,000.

Sixth. That the duration of said corporation is unlimited.

Then follows the signatures of the incorporators.

These are the things that the War Trade Board of the United States Russian Bureau (Inc.) wants to do, and for the accomplishment of these things the President has turned over to this board \$5,000,000; and not a man sitting on the floor of the House would vote money out of the Treasury of the United States for these express purposes. This incorporation needs more money to carry them out, and if we vote this \$100,000,000 the President has the same power to turn over any or all of it to this same corporation that he had to give it \$5,000,000.

Yes; we are asked now to appropriate \$100,000,000, just as we were asked during the war to appropriate, and did appropriate, a lump sum of \$100,000,000 for national security and defense. And if we vote this money, in the future we must not complain if any part of it is engaged in merchandising in all parts of the world, or in manufacturing in all parts of the world, or in mining and developing mines in all parts of the world, or in buying and owning and operating railroads, electric-light and gas plants, and banking, and everything under the sun, in all parts of the world.

To some of you the granting of this tremendous power may seem comical, but to my mind it is a most dangerous thing. I am willing that America shall do her part to feed the starving people of Europe, but I am not willing that we shall engage in all of these enterprises under the guise of preventing starvation.

I must confess that in one sense the situation is comical. Why, we are going to establish hotels in all parts of the world. Of course, that is one of the best ways to feed the people who are hungry. My attention was called a few days ago to the New York Hotel Review, a paper published by the New York hotels to exploit the wonderful things they have accomplished. I find a news item in this paper to the effect that John McE. Bowman, president of the Commodore, Biltmore, Manhattan, and other hotels, was commissioned to select a chef for the President's party during his trip abroad, and Mr. Sweeney was commissioned to select a culinary force. Mr. Bowman selected the chef of the Biltmore, Mr. Lewis Seres, and the article concludes:

Mr. Sweeney, however, in a comparatively short time interviewed, selected, and caused to be sworn into the United States Navy, a culinary crew of 25, which is the largest culinary crew ever gotten together for a transoceanic voyage. It might be said here that Mr. Sweeney was the man who selected the culinary force for the train that carried Prince Henry of Prussia to Canada on the occasion of his visit here several years ago. Four of the members of the culinary crew of the *George Washington* were sworn in as petty officers.

And I suppose that when Mr. Vance McCormick has acquired these hotels and restaurants and boarding houses in all parts of the world, that it is proposed to acquire under the terms of this charter, we will have as cooks in all of these hotels petty officers from the Navy, and possibly all of these will be selected by the same person who selected "the culinary force for the train which carried Prince Henry of Prussia to Canada on the occasion of his visit here several years ago."

Again, we are told that millions of people are starving in Europe. I suppose there is great suffering in many parts of

Europe. I wish we might prevent the starving of a single person. I wish we might do something in a big and substantial way to alleviate the suffering and prevent starving. But I have wondered whether or not this matter has not been a little overdrawn, for almost coincident with the cablegram of the President, I read an article in the New York Times, on December 28, under the following headlines:

Georgious scene at banquet—All royal formalities observed at King's dinner to Wilson—Largest display of plate—Gold service worth \$15,000,000 are brought from the palace vaults for occasion.

Can it be possible that almost within the shadow of the building where that banquet was given men and women were starving? Is it possible that that great Democrat could sit down to a table spread with a \$15,000,000 gold plate and then send a message to America within a day or two, telling us that millions were starving in Europe, and that we should give him \$100,000,000 to prevent it? [Applause.]

Now, what have we done in a practical way to relieve this distress? First, we have given to the Secretary of the Treasury power to loan money to all these countries of Europe that are mentioned in the hearings, and he has even loaned money to the Czecho-Slovaks, a great people, but whose organization as yet is practically only on paper; yet we are loaning money to them out of the Treasury, to feed their people. We are loaning money to Serbia and to the Balkan States. We have loaned vast sums to our other allies, including Russia, and the newspapers yesterday carried the statement from Mr. Glass that Government loans to foreign countries are restricted now to necessary credits for the purchase of foodstuffs in this country. It is apparent that not a single country mentioned in the hearings, which is in need of foodstuffs, is having any difficulty in borrowing the money from Uncle Sam to buy these necessities.

Now, in addition to that, in order to duplicate the service, it is proposed to give the President \$100,000,000 in order to feed these same people.

Mr. Speaker, a book has recently been written by Dr. E. A. Ross, of the University of Wisconsin, entitled "Russia in Upheaval." The author has been there and has just recently returned. I quote from page 13 of that book:

By the railroad, not far from Irkutsk, are piled up four millions of pounds of Siberian meat, spoiling in the July sun because there is no railway stock for moving it to Russia.

And again on page 334 I read:

From all sides we are receiving news of disorders and excesses at railway stations by soldiers and others. The railways are in the power of the mob. Cars are opened, and their contents plundered. Large numbers of profiteers are transporting goods arbitrarily without having paid anything on them. Cars are uncoupled from trains, thus interfering with the instructions of the railway servants. This state of anarchy has entirely disorganized the transport service.

Think of it! At Irkutsk, the author saw piled up 4,000,000 pounds of Siberian meat, spoiling in the July sun, because there was no railway stock to move it. It would require 8,000 average carcasses to make 4,000,000 pounds of meat; and the second statement of this author clearly shows why these foodstuffs can not be delivered to the people. Send American meat there, and is it not likely to be seized by the lawless and will it not only make them stronger in their fight against organized society? Much as we desire, we can not prevent starvation in Russia.

I desire also to call attention to the fact that already Mr. Hoover, through his grain corporation, has enough money to buy all the surplus wheat in the United States, and after he has bought it at \$2.20 per bushel, he will still have in his fund, according to the hearings, almost \$50,000,000 to buy other cereals. And remember, it is not urged that any corn be purchased for export to Europe for this purpose.

I call your attention to page 19 of the hearings, wherein it is shown that we raised in the United States last year 917,000,000 bushels of wheat. It is estimated by Mr. Hoover that it will take 600,000,000 bushels or thereabouts to feed our own population and to furnish seed for the next year, leaving 317,000,000 bushels available for export. Mr. Hoover's assistant states that 200,000,000 bushels have already been sold and exported to Europe, leaving only 117,000,000 bushels available for export. If every bushel of that was bought by Mr. Hoover at \$2.20 per bushel, it would require about \$257,000, and according to the statement of Mr. Glasgow, Mr. Hoover has for this purpose \$300,000,000. Hence, he would have \$50,000,000 left to buy other grains to feed the starving people of Europe after he had bought every bushel of American wheat available for export.

Now, if you will turn to page 4 of the hearings I think you will find the real secret of Mr. Hoover's desire. I quote:

Because of the stimulation of the production of hogs throughout the hog-producing sections of the country we have accumulated in the hands of packers, by reason of the run on hogs at this particular time of the year, a large surplus that we must work off as we can to Europe, and one of the purposes of Mr. Hoover has been, if possible, to provide a safe and regular drain of such edibles as fats, oils, and cereals that we have a surplus of to Europe.

You will observe that we are told that there is a surplus of fats and oils in the hands of the packers, by reason of the run of hogs at this particular time of the year, a large surplus that Mr. Hoover says must be worked off, quoting his words, in "a safe and regular drain." Ah, there must be no slump in the price of these fats in the hands of the packers; a safe and regular drain of this surplus of fats that are in the hands of the packers of the country must be sent to Europe, so that there can be no slump in the price, while this surplus is in their hands. [Applause.]

That is the crux of this whole matter, and you can not get away from it, and I want to say now that if this scheme of stabilizing the market is put through under the guise of saving the starving in Europe, hundreds, yes thousands, of our fellow Americans will, because of high prices that will be maintained, be made to suffer, and many of them will starve.

I am unwilling for one to permit the packer or any other producer in the United States to reach his hand down into the Treasury of the United States in order to stabilize and hold up the price of their product.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. No; I am sorry I do not have the time.

I find here in the Christian Science Monitor a statement with regard to the \$6,000,000 of profits made by the Cudahy Packing Co., from which I quote:

After paying the regular dividends on the preferred stock, the \$6,000,000 profit would represent an earning power of 47.4 per cent on the common stock.

It was inevitable that the packers would make money during the war. They were selling their product on a rising market. Vast sums were made by them because of that fact. They realized that the time was coming when they would be compelled to sell their product on a falling market, when they would lose some of these immense profits made during the war, and I doubt not they thought they would be able to so conduct their affairs that in balancing their books over a period of years it would be found that they had made considerably more money when they were doing business on a rising market than they had lost when they were selling their goods on a falling market.

Now, Mr. Hoover comes forward with his program, and that is to stabilize the market so long as there is a surplus of fats in the hands of the packers. I do not believe there is any justification for his program, and hence I must oppose it. I have opposed stabilizing the markets of the produce in the hands of the farmers, and I must oppose stabilizing the profits in the hands of the combination that has fared very well and can well afford now to meet the very obstacle that every business man must meet.

I want to see America do America's part in this emergency, but I am not willing to duplicate the service which 22,000,000 of Americans are already performing through the American Red Cross. It has been said here to-day that the allies are furnishing food to the starving, while America is talking about it. I deny it. America is doing her full share, through the American Red Cross, to-day. She is not only helping the poor in the Balkans and in Russia, but she is contributing to the wants of the poor and the needy in France and in Italy, and even Great Britain. The last report of the American Red Cross shows that there is appropriated for relief work in Belgium over \$2,000,000; for relief work in Italy, \$3,588,000; for relief work in Russia, \$1,243,000; and for relief work in Serbia, \$875,180; for relief work in Great Britain, \$1,885,000, and for relief in other foreign countries almost \$4,000,000. And yet, in order to put this bill through, without investigation and without a knowledge of the real facts, we are told that America is not doing her part. This bill ought to be sent back to the committee, with instructions to that committee to call before it the officers of the American Red Cross here in Washington, and to hear those officers, and then, after a full and comprehensive survey, which can be had within the next few days, report out a bill that will be the measure of America's obligation in this emergency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

APPENDIX.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY.

THE WAR TRADE BOARD OF UNITED STATES RUSSIAN BUREAU (INC.), CERTIFICATE OF ORGANIZATION.

The undersigned, a majority of the directors of the War Trade Board of United States Russian Bureau (Inc.), located in the town of Hartford, hereby certify as follows:

First. That the amount of the authorized capital stock of said corporation subscribed for is 50,000 shares, being shares of capital stock amounting to \$5,000,000 and being not less than the full amount of \$5,000,000, with which the incorporators in the certificate of incorporation stated the company would begin business.

Second. That the amount paid thereon in cash is \$5,000,000.

Third. That the amount paid thereon in property other than cash is nothing.

Fourth. That \$100 has been paid upon each share subscribed for, excepting no shares.

Fifth. That the name, residence, and address of each of the original subscribers to said stock, with the number of shares subscribed for by each, are as follows:

Name, residence, and post-office address.	Number of shares.
Vance C. McCormick, Harrisburg, Pa.	1
J. Beaver White, Washington, D. C.	1
Edwin F. Gay, Cambridge, Mass.	1
Clarence M. Woolley, Washington, D. C.	1
Albert Strauss, New York, N. Y.	1
Alonzo E. Taylor, Washington, D. C.	1
Thomas L. Chadbourne, jr., New York, N. Y.	1
H. Starr Giddings, Bronxville, N. Y.	1
Stoddard M. Stevens, jr., Hackensack, N. J.	1
Ralph Royall, New York, N. Y.	1
Vance C. McCormick, chairman War Trade Board, Washington, D. C.	49,990

Sixth. That the directors and officers of said corporation have been duly elected and that its by-laws have been adopted.

Seventh. The name, residence, and post-office address of each of the officers and directors of said corporation are as follows:

OFFICERS.

Name, residence, and post-office address:
President, Vance C. McCormick, Harrisburg, Pa.
Treasurer, John Foster Dulles, Washington, D. C.
Secretary, John Foster Dulles, Washington, D. C.

DIRECTORS.

Name, residence, and post-office address:
Vance C. McCormick, Harrisburg, Pa.
Thomas L. Chadbourne, jr., New York, N. Y.
Albert Strauss, New York, N. Y.
Alonzo E. Taylor, Washington, D. C.
Clarence M. Woolley, Washington, D. C.
J. Beaver White, Washington, D. C.
Edwin F. Gay, Cambridge, Mass.

Eighth. The location of its principal office in this State is No. 11 Central Row, Hartford, and the name of the agent or person in charge thereof on whom process against it may be served is Lucius F. Robinson. Dated at Washington, D. C., this 13th day of November, 1918.

EDWIN F. GAY,
J. BEAVER WHITE,
ALBERT STRAUSS,
ALONZO E. TAYLOR,
A Majority of the Directors.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,

City of Washington, ss:

On November 13, 1918, personally appeared Edwin F. Gay, J. Beaver White, Albert Strauss, and Alonzo E. Taylor, signers of the foregoing certificate of organization, a majority of the directors of the War Trade Board of United States, Russian Bureau (Inc.), and made oath to the truth of the same before me.

[SEAL.]

H. McHUGH,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

My commission expires August 9, 1923.

Approved December 2, 1918.

FREDERICK L. PERRY, Secretary,
By ELMER H. LOUNSBURY.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the speech the gentleman has just made is the most demagogic utterance I have ever heard on the floor of this House. He talks about a corporation that was organized for the purpose of carrying supplies and food to the starving people of Russia, and in no instance did he point out any abuse of the powers granted that corporation. I am not concerned about how the judgment and actions of this House to-day will affect Woodrow Wilson personally, but I am wondering how it will affect other people—not those for whom this relief is sought, for you know and I know if they are not relieved promptly their suffering, hunger, and distress will soon end in death. I am wondering how the action of the American Congress—how each vote and every utterance—will affect those people whose representatives are now sitting around the council table and who will be influenced in a greater or less degree by the representatives of the American Government.

The part this Government has played during this great world crisis is immeasurable. The influence it has wielded in bringing hostilities to a close has been incalculable. By his diplomacy President Wilson hastened the end, and the principles he enunciated have been accepted as the basic principles upon which peace will be made. It is due to his master genius that we have thus far approached peace. He is to-day recognized as the exponent of democracy, the apostle of justice, and the friend of liberty-loving peoples throughout the world. The estimate that the great masses of people in other countries place upon him will certainly be influenced to some extent by the confidence that his own people express in him.

The gentleman from Iowa talks about Bolshevism. Let me say to the gentleman that the spirit of Bolshevism, the most dangerous menace that has ever confronted free government, now rampant in the war-torn countries of central Europe, finds encouragement in disorder and threatens organized government

by creating dissension among the people. If ever there was a time when the representatives of organized government needed to present a united front, it is to-day. Discord and dissensions give encouragement to Bolshevism.

President Wilson knows the situation with which we are called upon in this way to deal. He is on the ground and has studied the situation from every angle. No man in the world to-day has the confidence of the great masses of other countries to the extent that the President of this country does, and those people are looking to him with hope and an abiding faith. Ah, the gentleman cynically refers to the dinner with the royalty of England. It was not only the royalty who received him, but low as well as high, the poor as well as the rich, the humble as well as the royal of foreign lands. In Manchester, the great industrial center of Britain, he was greeted with unsurpassed enthusiasm and every expression of commendation was showered upon him. At Brest and Paris and all along the routes he has traveled in France flowers have strewn his path and he has been received with wild acclaim. The people of Milan and the country for miles around crowded the streets of that city to do him honor and give demonstration of their appreciation of his great efforts in the interest of lasting peace.

The President has sought this relief for suffering humanity, and if we fail to grant it we are not only opposing humanity but will be embarrassing the representatives of this Government in the peace negotiations. So let me urge you, gentlemen, to stand by your Government at this time; stand by it until the peace treaty is written and ratified by the Senate.

The American people have always been charitable, and they have manifested that spirit to greater extent during this great world crisis. They have contributed millions of dollars, not through the Government particularly but through other agencies, for the relief of the suffering people—Belgium, Serbia, and France—and to-day a great campaign is on to raise a large fund for the relief of stricken Armenia.

You can not afford to hold back on technicalities in this instance; you can not excuse your opposition to this measure by calling for details. Your views and actions in this instance will be construed as in the interest of suffering humanity or against humanity; as upholding the spokesman of your Government or opposing him.

I am not unmindful of the fact that some of you on that side of the House are intoxicated on success as the result of the recent elections, and in your political debauchery you have gone wild; but be not deceived. That little woman who lives in an humble cottage out yonder on the western plains, that patriotic farmer in the remote and out-of-way sections of the southland, as well as the toiler in the busy city who gave their sons to fight for the peace that our representatives are contending for will want to know the reason why you attempted at this time to embarrass your Government. And every boy who is now encamped on the western front awaiting the signing of the treaty of peace will want to know the reason for this opposition and obstruction.

Be not deceived, gentlemen, this war is not over yet; the treaty of peace has not been signed, and we must strengthen the hold that our representatives have in order to obtain the things for which our boys have fought, and your obstruction here to-day will either strengthen or hamstring their arms.

Let me suggest to you who are opposing this measure the story of the ass who was so unmanageable and untractable that no pasture no matter how green could restrain his roving disposition; no fence was strong enough to withhold him. So his master placed a yoke and bell around his neck. One day the ambitious ass broke through the fence and wandered over roads and fields to a near-by city and there paraded up and down the street, his yoke swinging from side to side and his bell ringing. He attracted the attention of passers-by and was very proud of his accomplishments. Presently his master came along and caught him, saying to the ass: "You are deceiving yourself. If you think your actions are attractive and pleasing to the crowds you are mistaken. That yoke you wear is not an emblem of praise, but a badge of dishonor."

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DENISON. The President came before us and said that it was necessary to vote for woman suffrage, in order to win the war. Does the gentleman stand by the President in that? [Laughter.]

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Oh, the gentleman can not lead me astray on that proposition. He knows it is afield of this discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEWALT). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POU. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman knows that I differed with the President on that proposition. But the gentleman knows, too, that when I cast my vote in the House, the President had not come before the Senate and laid down any such proposition. I did not believe then, nor do I now believe, that woman suffrage is a war measure. The gentleman is merely trying to justify his indefensible position. My record in this House since this crisis arose has been to stand by Woodrow Wilson, not because he was a Democrat but because he was the President of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. McCULLOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Does the gentleman regard it as treason to ask for information?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I do not.

Mr. McCULLOCH. That is all that we are doing here.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman can not excuse himself in that way. The American people will accept your action to-day either as not standing by our representatives in France and embarrassing them or encouraging them and upholding their hands.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Then, in order to get justice, we must pay tribute.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. If the gentleman thinks that, then well and good.

Sirs, I am heartily in favor of this legislation. I am in favor of every piece of legislation that our representatives in France believe will aid in the slightest degree in securing a speedy and just settlement of the issues of the war upon the enunciated principles of our President. I have never, up until this good hour, since this crisis began cast a single vote or given expression to a single sentiment that would hamper my Government and its representatives. And I shall pursue that course when I have left the activities of this body to take up my duties in the other end of this Capitol. I shall be moved by the same purpose, namely, to stand by the representatives of this Government in their peace negotiations and to wage war upon everyone who is its enemy. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Kansas how many speeches are to be made on that side?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Only one.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I shall submit one or two observations very briefly. Now, I am not going to criticize the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. I am not going to charge that he made a demagogic speech, but I am going to say this: There are a few gentlemen on the Republican side of the aisle, and possibly a few on this side of the aisle, whose position is always known before they speak. Whenever they arise to address the House the House knows in advance what is coming. When the gentleman from Iowa arose both sides of the House knew exactly what to expect—a bitter speech and abusive of the President of the United States.

It is said we need more information. What more information can the House of Representatives desire? The President of the United States has gone in person to Europe. Whether you criticize the wisdom of his trip or not, he is there. He has had opportunity to consult with the representatives of all the nations of the world, and after careful investigation he cabled to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of this House that \$100,000,000 is urgently needed in order to save people from starvation. Do you want additional evidence? We have appropriated billions in the prosecution of this war, but we must hesitate here, we must quibble, we must play politics, because that is what is being done here to-day, in response to the request of the President of the United States that he needs \$100,000,000 to save certain peoples of Europe from starvation. Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, Republicans and Democrats, we shame ourselves if we turn down that request, we shame our Nation if we turn down such a request as this. I think you Republicans may well set a precedent here and now. You will soon be in control. The next House of Representatives is yours, and I make this prediction: You will be appropriating money for this very object, because we are all Americans, and while our prejudices may get the better of us for a short while, there is no red-blooded American who is going to let women and children starve anywhere on earth, if he can prevent it. That is the plain issue that is presented here to-day. People are starving now. We alone have the food. Shall we save them or let them die? You must answer to-day.

Mr. Speaker, I can not for my life understand this constant criticism that we hear of Herbert Hoover. I have heard arguments actually advanced that gentlemen would not vote for this appropriation because Hoover was going to spend the

money. What has Hoover done to justify any charge against him? He has proven himself the most efficient man that could possibly have been found throughout the length and breadth of civilization. He has handled tens of millions of dollars, and up to this good hour, so far as I know, the finger of suspicion has never been pointed at him. But it is "that man Hoover." Because Hoover, having a thankless job—a job that nobody wanted—has had the courage to stand up and do his duty he is to be criticized, and that is to be used as an excuse for opposing this bill! Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying this: Whatever may be said about the House of Representatives, it is American on both sides of the aisle, and this request coming from the President of the United States for \$100,000,000 to save people from starvation is not going to be denied by Americans in this House. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time—nine and a half minutes—to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this is an occasion when we are determining whether we shall act from judgment or from emotion, whether what we do is the result of a logical conclusion of reasoning or a mere impulse. Thus far the proponents of this measure are undertaking to force conviction by attempting to make it appear that the opposition is merely partisan and political. I merely rise to state that kind of statement is not argument. If it should so appear that one side opposes a proposition and another favors it, why should not the side opposing it say to the side that favors it that they are putting it purely upon a partisan basis? Why should not the Republicans say that the Democrats are making it a partisan matter? I do not make that charge against the Democratic side, and they have no right to make that charge against the Republican side—that the opposition to this resolution or authorization is purely partisan, that it is in order to embarrass the President. It was so stated—that we must pass it or it will embarrass the President. That was stated on the floor here, and it has been stated elsewhere. If the President is to be embarrassed, it is not by our vote; but it probably is his indiscretion that makes it an embarrassment which our vote will not relieve. It has been also stated that we must do it to reduce the danger of the Bolsheviki movement. That was stated on this floor and it has been stated in the argument for this bill. I would suggest that one of the best ways to reduce the evils of bolshevism is not by undertaking to bribe it in the shape of food nor by undertaking to flirt with it, but is by undertaking to deal with it by law, as has been too often noted in and out of official life, especially as it is found in our own country. My opposition to this measure is that it is of doubtful wisdom to pay out of the Treasury of the United States, whether the funds come by taxation or by loan, public money collected for specific purposes on demand on the part of a foreign government when war no longer continues. I voted with the rest of you to authorize the loans to the foreign governments during war. While they were not our allies, we were associated with them and the purposes of the two were the same. Therefore I did not hesitate to vote for authorization of loans; but let me say to the Democratic side of the House it is a source of criticism to borrow money from our own people at a certain fixed rate and loan it to foreign governments—even to our allies—at the same rate when those very governments loan to their own people at from 2 to 3½ per cent greater than we are loaning to them. [Applause.] I raise the question of discretion, whether because we did it in time of war—a doubtful thing in its wisdom even then—we should continue to do it when war no longer exists; and, for one, I shall not hesitate to withhold my support of this proposition. I will not now agree to take out of the Treasury of the United States, whether it be replenished by taxation or loan, in both of which cases it comes from the people—from the earnings of our own people—money to lend to any other country when war has ceased. So much for that phase of the opposition.

There is another phase, and that is the manner in which this gift is asked. I am at the point where I shall cease to vote further an indiscriminate amount of money in unlimited quantities to any single individual to use at his own discretion, I do not care who that man is. [Applause.] The hundred million dollars is but the beginning. If it is right, and we are justified in voting \$100,000,000 because it is asked for, then we must by the same force vote the next \$100,000,000 that is bound to be asked for. There is no limit to this thing, and as a representative of the people of one district in Ohio I regard myself as the trustee of the burdens they are called upon to bear to conduct this Government, and while I shall give of my own to the very limit of my ability for a charitable purpose, I shall leave my people to do likewise, and will not give of their own

earnings without their consent. That is a phase of opposition to this bill that I can not overcome. The bill says it is to feed the people outside of Germany. It was not so stated at first. Only this morning the press quotes Mr. Hoover as saying that by spring Germany would be upon the verge of famine. It is coming from every source that the German Bolsheviki movement is producing nameless distress in Germany, and if our purpose is to prevent this movement, and you ask this bill upon that basis, then are you going to send it to Germany? I do not commit a breach of confidence, but we have been told that this side of the House, with that side of the House, will soon be voting appropriations out of the Treasury to feed the German suffering people. Before we embark upon such a campaign it will be well for us to wait until we hear from our own sons, some of them in German prisons, as to the treatment of Americans at the hands of Germans. If we are to legislate by emotion rather than upon a rational basis, let the Congress study the attitude of our enemy toward our own and our associate peoples.

Before we set out on the basis of preventing the Bolsheviki movement in Germany and retarding it in other lands of Europe let us first look to our own household, take care of our own interests here. Of course, there is suffering, war is inevitable to produce suffering, but let the Red Cross organization set out the facts and then let us appeal to our own people who will meet the issue. Let us proceed upon that basis to raise this fund and I will vote for it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining? The SPEAKER pro tempore. Twelve minutes.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining 12 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, the day the armistice was signed most of us in America mentally took off our war clothes and hung them in the closet and immediately proceeded to get out the old peace suit that we had worn years ago and said, "Now, let us go back to old conditions." And while that may be a very natural desire it is a long ways from being a possibility and the one thing that the people of America need to bear in mind, not only in considering this proposal which is now before the House but in many that are to come hereafter, is that while fighting has ceased we have not reached a condition of peace and that the world has not, and perhaps can not, save through many days of bitter travail, go back to the old conditions, and men's minds that refuse a recognition of that fundamental fact are minds that refuse to keep pace with the movement of the world and of the times. [Applause.] And for us to stand here and speak of and deal with the proposal that is now before the House as we might have dealt with such a proposal 4 or 5 or 10 years back or 4 or 5 or 10 years forward is to ignore facts that stare every man in the face. I had hoped that the need of this proposal would so appeal to men that there would be no great division upon it. I recall what the gentleman from Illinois alluded to. How there came a message from President Roosevelt to the Congress of the United States asking \$800,000 to be voted for the relief of the people of Italy who were suffering from a great eruption, a great earthquake. It passed the Committee on Appropriations unanimously and it came out on the floor and went through the House and Senate unanimously. Some one suggested, was it given to the President to do as he pleased with. The act is quite brief, it is so short that I think it is worth reading:

That to enable the President of the United States to procure and distribute among the suffering and destitute people of Italy such provisions, clothing, medicine, and other necessary articles, and to take such other steps as he shall deem advisable for the purpose of rescuing and succoring the people who are in peril and threatened with starvation, the sum of \$800,000 is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

In the execution of this act the President is requested to ask and obtain the approval of the Italian Government, and he is hereby authorized to employ any vessels of the United States Navy and to charter and employ any other suitable steamships or vessels.

No limitation of any kind or requirement for report as to expenditure, no audit but a blanket appropriation that was most gladly voted to Theodore Roosevelt, knowing that he, like every other President of the United States, was honest and could be trusted in great emergencies to deal in the interest of the country that has given him its highest possible office. Now, so much for that. Everyone who has spoken in opposition to this proposal has spoken on the assumption that America was undertaking to do a thing of its own accord without consultation and without cooperation of the allies, with whom it has been working since our entrance into the war. I deny it. I state that there is to-day in existence an interallied commission for the purpose of

the distribution of food and of relief to these people, and I will read to the House the names of some of the men who are on that commission.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Just briefly.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman state when that commission was appointed?

Mr. SHERLEY. Well, I will give the gentleman such information as I have. I know what is in the gentleman's mind. He would have the impression to go out that the President and Mr. Hoover have forced the allies to enter into this scheme and that it is simply one that originated with Mr. Hoover and with the President. I deny it. I say to you that before the cable from the President was sent to the Congress on the 2d of January there had already been an agreement in substantial form by the allied nations as to the creation of such a commission.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to proceed—

Mr. MADDEN. For a simple question. Does the gentleman know whether the allied nations, the entente allies, made any such appropriation or joined in such appropriations as is proposed to be made here?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know whether they made appropriations, but I know they are furnishing food and transportation and actual relief while we are talking about it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now, as the representatives of Great Britain, there are on the commission—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would like to complete this sentence without interruption. I want to be accommodating, but I have a limited amount of time. As the representatives of Great Britain, Lord Reading, ambassador to the United States, and Sir John Beale, chairman of the Wheat Executive Commission. On the part of France there is Clementel, minister of commerce, and Mr. Vilgrain, undersecretary of state for supply.

In regard to Italy, the information comes that their commissioners are on the way, and in their absence Signor Attolico, of the Interallied Food Council, is authorized to act for them. On the part of America are Mr. Hoover and Mr. Davis, Mr. Davis having been a representative of the Treasury Department who went abroad in order to represent them and who has been designated by the President in connection with this matter.

And so I repeat that this is not simply a proposal of the United States. It is likely true, I hope it is true, that the United States representatives urged that the head of that commission should be a representative of the United States of America. Most of the food must come from America, and, thank God, America is in a position to furnish that food without suffering and want to her own people. [Applause.] To my mind it is not a matter to be complained of, but a matter of congratulation, that America in this great reconstruction work is taking a premier part, a leadership, and that an American representative is to be at the head of the commission.

Now, much is undertaken to be said here about people favoring relief but objecting to method, and the same gentleman who in one moment says he would trust the Red Cross but would not trust the President, in the next breath complains because some one suggests partisanship. I do not suggest partisanship. Since this war started I have made no partisan speech. God knows the issues that confront the world are too big for any of us to let our little biases and prejudices control us. Though I believed the President and Mr. Hoover were thoroughly disreputable—and no man dares charge it or produce one scintilla of proof to justify it—yet they are the representatives of the American Government abroad. The President and those that sit with him are our representatives there, and they are our representatives in accordance with the Constitution that gives to the Executive the initiation of foreign affairs and of matters of treaty.

In the general debate I will read a telegram from Mr. White, the Republican member of the commission there, urging the passage of this bill and stating the need for it to be passed. I say to you that men who deny the need of relief in Europe deny it in the face of overwhelming facts. Why, there is not a man who can read a newspaper with discernment but that knows to-day that one of the very greatest, in fact the greatest, problem of Europe is the problem of food. And there is not a man who knows history but that knows that you can not talk reason to men whose bellies are pinching with hunger; that you can not get order and stability while men and women and children die of starvation.

It is not proposed to give this food to Germany. She has money with which to buy food, and she will have to pay for

what food she gets from us or from our allies, and she will only get food then to the extent that we can give it after dealing with the needs of our allies and our friends. Austria-Hungary has gone to pieces. In what composed that dual monarchy are now several groups of people, our friends, who have not food. Roumania has not; Serbia has not. But the gentleman reads from a book about the mass of food that was found in northern Russia.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. It was there because of the absence of transportation. It was not there as an indication of surplus. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the rule.

The question was taken, and the rule was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Accordingly the House, in accordance with the rule, resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 13708, with Mr. GARD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary.

Be it enacted, etc., That for the participation by the Government of the United States in the furnishing of foodstuffs and other urgent supplies, and for the transportation, distribution, and administration thereof to such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President from time to time as necessary, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, in the discretion of the President, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$100,000,000, which may be used as a revolving fund until June 30, 1919, and which shall be audited where practicable in the same manner as other expenditures of the Government are audited: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be reimbursed so far as possible by the Governments or subdivisions thereof or the peoples to whom relief is furnished: *Provided further*, That a report of the receipts and expenditures under this appropriation shall be submitted to Congress not later than the first day of the next regular session.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, three hours and one-quarter are prescribed for general debate.

Mr. SHERLEY. When I have used 10 minutes, I wish to be notified.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. When will amendments to the bill be in order under the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. After the expiration of the general debate, I am informed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What course will one pursue who desires to offer an amendment? To give notice during his speech or wait until the expiration of the general debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the five-minute rule after general debate.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I did not quite understand what the gentleman said about the time for offering amendments to this bill. It is all one section, I assume. Is it to be assumed that the bill will not be read again, but that the amendments can be offered at any time when the bill is under consideration under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the bill will be read under the five-minute rule, and at that time amendments may be offered.

Mr. MADDEN. It will be read as one section?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In view of that ruling by the Chair, I inquire whether it will be permissible to debate the amendment when offered under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. In the time prescribed by the rule, on presentation to the committee.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TOWNER. As I understood the Chair to state, he recognized the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] for three hours.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the Chair stated he recognized the gentleman from Kentucky for the time prescribed under the

rule, which was one-half of three and one-quarter hours. The gentleman desired to consume 10 minutes only at this time.

Mr. TOWNER. And this side will be recognized for one-half the time?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. The Chair will, of course, credit me with this time, which I have not used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized from now.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the bill is very short. It provides for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for participation by the Government of the United States in the furnishing of foodstuffs and other urgent supplies, and for the transportation, distribution, and administration thereof, to such populations in Europe outside of Germany as may be determined upon by the President from time to time as necessary, and for each and every purpose connected therewith in the discretion of the President.

There is then provided that expenditures hereunder shall be reimbursed as far as possible by the Governments or subdivisions thereof or by the peoples to whom relief is furnished. It provides that, so far as practicable, there shall be an audit of expenditures, and it provides that there shall be a report made at the next regular session of Congress of all receipts and expenditures under the fund.

It has been estimated that it will require something like a billion and a half dollars' worth of foodstuffs to supply Europe's needs this coming year. It is believed that something over \$300,000,000 will probably have to be expended by the allies in the way of either gift or loan of foodstuffs to the suffering peoples. The condition in Europe is bad beyond description. I have here any number of cables from abroad touching the conditions in various countries. In Vienna the food shortage is very great; in Roumania, in Serbia, among the Czechoslovaks, in a large part of Russia. There will be this coming year several millions of people who will die in Russia from starvation in spite of anything that anybody can do for them, and no man can exaggerate the actual condition of want that exists.

Bolshevism is constantly spreading westward. It has overrun Russia. It is practically overrunning Poland. It threatens to engulf all of Germany. The remedy for it is one of two things—bullets or bread. You can stop Bolshevism by killing all of the Bolsheviks, but you can also prevent the spread of it by helping starving people to live.

I believe the people of America prefer that method to one of continued warfare. I do not believe that it is possible to have stable governments with which the peace conference can deal without some preliminary relief in the way of food to many of the peoples involved.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. I do not want to disturb you in your line of thought, but you spoke of Russia and the enormous number of people who will die of starvation there in the coming year. Now, I assume, but perhaps the gentleman knows, however, that the great mass of those people are in the interior of Russia, and the cities and the more congested portions are under the control of these revolutionists, the Bolsheviks, who control the transportation. What I want to ask is a practical question: How do you expect, within two or three months which you give as the time in which this starvation would take place, to get this food to those starving people?

Mr. SHERLEY. To those starving people I do not expect it. That is the reason why I stated that a million or more would die of starvation, irrespective of anything that could be done. But if the people for whom this fund can be used can be reached, such starvation will not come to them. They can be reached, and they are being reached already. Our allies are doing what they can. England is feeding Serbia. Italy is helping. Food is being given to Roumania. We are also selling food to neutrals, and there can be, and will be, real relief over a great area.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] has just said that the starving people in Russia are principally those in the interior. The President's letter says, "Extended investigation and consideration of the food situation in certain parts of Europe disclose that especially the urban populations in certain areas" are faced with absolute starvation, indicating that it applies to cities as well.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is no question but that in great parts of Russia there is great suffering that can not be relieved.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. What, if any, funds are now in the Treasury which would be available for the purpose sought for in this bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. As far as I know of, there are no funds in the Treasury, except such balances as may exist in connection with the President's fund, which can be used in his discretion.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Can the gentleman state what is left of that \$100,000,000?

Mr. SHERLEY. I could not state. I have no doubt that some of the moneys have probably been given by the President out of his fund in connection with food relief now, because this food situation is pressing hour by hour and day by day.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HICKS. Can the gentleman give us some information as to what some of the other powers are doing in the way of financial assistance along the same lines?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not able to give the gentleman any information regarding any detailed proposition in dollars and cents that France and Great Britain and Italy will contribute, but I am advised by the State Department that all of them have agreed to carry their share of the burden and do all they can in this great relief; that England is now actually furnishing large quantities of foodstuffs to Serbia, that she is also furnishing other foodstuffs elsewhere and transportation, and that Italy and France are helping; and there is nothing to warrant any one in the belief that our allies are not in good faith proposing to cooperate to the extent of their abilities.

In that same connection it must be borne in mind that, speaking by and large, the food, as distinguished from money—the actual food—must come out of America, because only in America are any large surplus stocks.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does the gentleman believe that any of the funds that will be realized from the proposed issue of bonds could be used for these purposes without further legislative authority?

Mr. SHERLEY. I know of no authority that exists for the use of those moneys for this purpose directly. Presumably the Secretary of the Treasury, if he saw fit, under existing law could make advances to our allies, and the allies in turn might agree to use that money for relief work.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then, under the gentleman's theory, he might use some of it?

Mr. SHERLEY. No. We might not use it; we could loan to our allies and might, if we wanted to, make a gentlemen's agreement as to how they would use the moneys loaned to them. But there is no law that I know of that authorizes expenditures out of the Treasury in the way of gifts or foodstuffs to the starving people of Europe.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can I call the gentleman's attention to the limited phraseology that authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to advance funds to foreign governments? The gentleman need not answer unless he sees fit.

Mr. SHERLEY. The act speaks for itself. I speak only from memory. The gentleman from Ohio is familiar, of course, with that language, because he helped to report the bill and pass it, carrying the money.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, the phraseology shows that the Secretary of the Treasury is only limited to advance these credits to such foreign governments as were then engaged in war in cooperation with the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, if the gentleman will permit—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair admonishes the gentleman from Kentucky that he has already used 10 minutes of his time.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will use five minutes more. If the committee will permit, I will read from a cablegram of date of January 6:

The British are already furnishing from army stocks food and clothing. Relief to Serbia and Syria, the Italians of South Austria. The British and French are advancing money for transport Belgian relief. Allies are willing and anxious to do all they can and have and will contribute to the full extent of their resources; but must be borne in mind that most of the food must be purchased in the United States, and American money would be used for such purpose and transportation.

Now, that cablegram has been followed by a number of others, all to the same effect. I repeat that I have no information as to the exact pro rata basis upon which the other Gov-

ernments have agreed—if they have agreed—with America, as to this relief; but, knowing the amount of money that is being asked, knowing the extent of the relief that is needed, I do not believe that \$100,000,000 at this time represents an undue contribution on the part of America in the solution of these tremendously pressing matters. And I do not share at all with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] his fear that because we vote \$100,000,000 we will be compelled to vote other sums ad infinitum. I believe that he and I believe that I and those who come after us will have intelligence enough to deal with situations as they arise, and I know of no case that can be stated—the gentleman is a logician—that can not be destroyed by carrying it to the absurd degree of the fears of those who are opposed to it. Anybody can by speculating that this means something else—and it is pure speculation—draw the conclusion logically, if he chooses so to call it, that therefore the thing should not be undertaken.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman stated "knowing the extent of the relief required." Where have we any definite knowledge as to the extent of the relief required? Is it not true that this is a mere guess?

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, the gentleman may quibble about the word "definiteness." I do not know how to get in time definiteness of information as to the money it is going to cost to feed starving people while they are starving. I do know, however, that men whose business it has been to make a survey tell us what in their judgment will probably be necessary; and having in mind the exigencies, physical, political, and social, that exist, I consider that that is as definite as practical men ought to want, and that a man who insists upon the definiteness that comes from a census enumeration is either fooling himself or undertaking to fool others as to the character of his opposition to the matter.

Mr. FESS. It is easier to vote a mere guess, and that is what this is.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, the gentleman quoted his own fear. I prefer Mr. Hoover's estimate to the gentleman's fear.

Mr. FESS. How long has Mr. Hoover been over there?

Mr. SHERLEY. He has been over there for a month or more. He has had representatives there for many months, and we have been getting information since the beginning of the war as to food conditions.

Mr. FESS. And the request has been made since Mr. McCormick reached there.

Mr. SHERLEY. The request may have been made, but that again is evidence of wonderful logic. A man goes at a certain time. A request comes at a certain time. Therefore it comes because the man went there! I submit it again to the gentleman as an evidence of that conclusive character of logic which is being given us here to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The objection of the gentleman from Ohio finally was to the President expending the fund.

Mr. FESS. That is only one objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. In the first five minutes of his remarks he stated that he would not vote to tax his people for this purpose. Then finally he said if the Red Cross would administer it he would vote for it.

Mr. FESS. I would. That is only one objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. But, if the gentleman please, I am not willing to discuss this question on the ground of personal opinions of individuals touching this man and that man. In all the abuse that has been heaped upon Mr. Hoover I have yet to hear any concrete evidence of wrongdoing on his part. I have yet to hear any fact that justifies distrust of him. He has performed for the world a great service in my judgment. [Applause.] But I say to you that we are faced with a situation where we have either to repudiate the representatives of the country because of our belief about men or go forward with this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has used five additional minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In the testimony taken before the gentleman's committee it is stated that Great Britain and France have already joined in an arrangement for the distribution of relief for these people; and that Italy is soon to join. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he had received infor-

mation since as to just what organization is to distribute this relief—if it is interallied relief?

Mr. SHERLEY. I stated to the House that there would be two representatives each from England, France, Italy, and the United States.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. They are to cooperate?

Mr. SHERLEY. And that the question of distribution, quantities, methods of transportation, and persons to whom distributed would be determined by this interallied commission.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHERLEY. And I desire to state that as having been given to me authoritatively in a cablegram from overseas.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman has stated the fact that England is active in this matter. The public press carries notice that the British Government has canceled its contracts made with this country largely for the purchase of food supplies, upon the representation that they did not need any more. Now, the thing is going to occur that we are going to have a great surplus of wheat in this country if our crop goes on. Will not this money be available for the purchase of wheat in this country?

Mr. SHERLEY. I take it that practically every dollar of it which shall be expended in the way of food will be expended for food bought in America.

Something was said about the condition of food. There is a very large surplus of wheat in this country over our needs. This country is under guaranty to maintain the price of wheat that shall be offered for sale until June 30, and in addition to that this country has undertaken by agreement—not by law, but agreements that have been enforced in good faith—to maintain a minimum price for live stock that should be offered for sale. That has been maintained. There is a very large surplus of cattle, and particularly of hogs, over the needs of this country. That surplus can be used, and will need to be used, in Europe, but if we undertake not to export it you will immediately disturb and break to pieces the markets of the country.

I have no desire to maintain high prices. I know what some men will say, particularly those men who want to appeal to the unthinking, about the poor of our cities, that they ought to have relief, but I repeat again that we can not think simply in terms of our own geography in this day and generation. It would be a lasting disgrace to America if, having entered the war, our efforts should cease the moment the fighting had ceased, if we ceased to have any vision, and confined our views simply to the selfish desires of ourselves. [Applause.] If there be men so little of soul who want to think only in terms of selfishness, I say to those that, considering the standpoint of the Treasury, the expenditure is money well invested. I do not want to see the armies of occupation turned again into active warring armies in Europe. I believe, as I believe in my existence, that unless the allies solve some of the pressing problems of food that exist abroad, you will see a resumption of the fighting. I want the boys to come home. I want the boys here again. I am not afraid to risk \$100,000,000 for feeding these people when I voted the huge sums for the prosecution of the war that I and my colleagues have voted in the past.

Now, I must not take longer time, in justice to those who are to follow. I want to read from a cablegram that was sent by Henry White to Senator LODGE, and I read it with the permission of Senator LODGE:

January 8, 7 p. m. For Senator LODGE from Mr. Henry White:

"Feel I should no longer delay laying before you condition which has been gradually forcing itself upon our delegation and which now dominates entire European situation above all else, namely, steady westward advance of Bolshevism. It now completely controls Russia and Poland, and is spreading through Germany. Only effective barrier now apparently possible against it is food relief, as Bolshevism thrives only on starvation and disorder. I consider it therefore of utmost importance that President's request for one hundred million appropriation for relief be granted at once. Impossible to inaugurate peace conference under proper auspices without previous adequate provision to cope with situation. Aside from stoppage of Bolshevism, I understand there is in United States considerable surplus of food accumulated at high prices, maintenance whereof guaranteed our Government or assurance under its auspices, and that it is necessary to dispose of this surplus in order to relieve warehouse and financial facilities, as well as prevent serious fall in prices, with radical break in market, which would cost our country more than the appropriation asked for. The appropriation is not for the purpose of advancing money to Germany, which will pay on a cash basis for any food sent there. Allies are already furnishing relief to liberated territories and are disposed to assist otherwise to extent of their available resources, but most of the food must come from the United States. I can not too strongly impress upon you urgency of meeting situation herein described."

I submit that for the consideration of those gentlemen who do not think any good can come out of Nazareth, and who are unwilling to accept any representation that the President of

the United States or Mr. Hoover might make touching the matter. For the great mass of the people of America who believe that the President is earnestly and capably representing the people of the United States in this great work abroad, I desire to read this cablegram which I received from him on January 11.

I can not too earnestly or solemnly urge upon the Congress the appropriation for which Mr. Hoover has asked for the administration of food relief. Food relief is now the key to the whole European situation and to the solutions of peace. Bolshevism is steadily advancing westward, is poisoning Germany. It can not be stopped by force, but it can be stopped by food; and all the leaders with whom I am in conference agree that concerted action in this matter is of immediate and vital importance. The money will not be spent for food for Germany itself, because Germany can buy its food; but it will be spent for financing the movement of food to our real friends in Poland and to the people of the liberated units of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and to our associates in the Balkans. I beg that you will present this matter with all possible urgency and force to the Congress. I do not see how we can find definite powers with whom to conclude peace unless this means of stemming the tide of anarchism be employed.

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. I would like to ask the chairman what would be the effect of this phraseology of the bill on page 4:

Provided, That expenditures hereunder shall be reimbursed so far as possible by the Governments or subdivisions thereof or the peoples to whom relief is furnished.

Mr. SHERLEY. The legal effect is simply this: The money is given to the President to be used in his discretion. Of course that discretion could override that indication of the will of Congress, but it also has the great value of indicating that Congress expects the money expended for food and used for this relief to be recompensed where funds or securities are available. It is an indication of the intent.

Mr. EMERSON. And not binding?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is not fully binding in a legal sense; the gentleman realizes that we can not give the President discretion in moneys to be expended and then bind that discretion. The gentleman will also realize that you could not compel the food to be given only for value, because that would destroy some of the main purposes of the bill and of the need of the situation abroad. We must leave it in the discretion of the President.

Now, I beg gentlemen that in the consideration of this matter they will consider that this country has been exceedingly fortunate, in that it has never yet had a President that it had to hesitate to trust touching financial expenditure.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a single suggestion?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I want to suggest to the gentleman that wherever it can be audited the bill provides that it shall be audited—a Treasury audit—and where it can not be it shall be reported to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session, and the House of Representatives can get at it if they think it was improperly expended.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, I want to say one other word in connection with what was suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. He read you here amid great glee on the part of one or two gentlemen the articles of incorporation of a company that had been incorporated to do business in Russia. The articles of incorporation providing that company might engage in every kind of business, I take it—and the gentleman from Connecticut will correct me if it is not so—is one of those blanket charters that the State of Connecticut permits to be granted to corporations to do business outside of Connecticut.

This is the important fact, and it shows the difference between insinuation and fact. The gentleman told you about this incorporation. He then stated that he presumed that this corporation would be used as a medium for the disposition of the funds, although there is not a scintilla of evidence to warrant that belief, and I deny that it will be so used; but I call attention to this fact: There was not a word of proof offered to show that any wrongdoing had grown out of the creation of that corporation. Let us carry back our minds a little while. I like sometimes to do so, though not to have it stay back. Let us go back to the time when there was a great deal of agitation in America over helping Russia with supplies, and that boots and shoes, as the common expression went, were of more value than soldiers and bayonets. It may have been very proper to have created a corporation as a medium whereby the Government and those merchants of America who wanted to send supplies through to Russia might be able to do it. Remember we were controlling, and we are still in large measure controlling, exports from this country. We were controlling its shipping and tonnage. The trouble is that gentlemen refuse to think about the unusual conditions that have surrounded the Government and that have made unusual remedies necessary; but what I

ask is that before men vote against this relief proposal because of the creation of a corporation by the War Trade Board some proof be submitted that there has been something wrong, something corrupt, something unwise, something loose done by virtue of that corporation, and that it is to be the medium for doing similar things in connection with this fund.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. The articles of incorporation which I read were not in blanket form but were an unusual form. The corporation was incorporated as late as December 2, 1918, and every dollar of the money, the \$5,000,000, was given to that corporation by the President, that the War Trade Board holds the stock as directors, and the things provided for are unlawful under the laws of the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. All right; I am willing to accept all of the gentleman's statements of facts, but I decline to follow his conclusion as a lawyer as to what constitutes unlawfulness. I should want to look further at the record. But take the case as stated. I personally would rather that all the stock be owned by the Government than that part of it be owned by the Government, and I think most men here would. I again submit to the House that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has not produced a scintilla of evidence to show that any wrongdoing has come out of the creation of that corporation. I do not want to take further time of the House now, but again I ask those gentlemen who are so persistent for detailed information to see to it that they do not follow fears, which they take for information.

Of the frightful conditions in Europe there can be no doubt. I will, under extension of remarks, place in the RECORD extracts from cables received from abroad showing some of these conditions. Of our ability to supply foodstuffs there is no question. We have a billion and a half dollars' worth of surplus food that we can and should export to Europe. Most of it will be exported and sold for cash. We are asked by this bill only to authorize the use of a hundred millions in conjunction with aid given by our allies to buy food for relief of those unable through regular channels and methods to obtain food. The need for such action is believed in not only by our representatives at the peace conference but by the allied Governments' representatives. The success, nay, the initiation, of the work of the peace conference is in great measure dependent on such relief work. Shall America give the lie to her statements of purpose, to that idealism that has been her guiding star in all the dark days of the war by refusing this aid? Shall she be not only so selfish but so lacking in creative statesmanship as to hold back because, forsooth, we can not say that each dollar we spend will be matched by one from each of our chief allies? This has not been her way of aiding humanity in the past. It will not be her way now.

[Copies of cablegrams received from time to time from American representatives relative to the food situation in Europe.]

JANUARY 6, 1919.

Very urgent. Rickard, Food Administration. Food 173. Your 118.

The British are already furnishing from army stocks food and clothing relief to Serbia and Syria, the Italians to South Austria. The British and French are advancing the money for transport Belgian relief. Allies are willing and anxious to do all they can, and have and will contribute to the full extent of their resources, but must be borne in mind that most of the food must be purchased in the United States, and American money would be used for such purchase and transportation. Your 107 as to using this revolving fund. It would, in effect, be such a fund, but it must be borne in mind that it would ultimately be absorbed in giving credits possibly over long periods to such peoples and institutions as our Treasury could not properly advance under the law, and some of it would be lost in sheer charity. This is not to replace Treasury advances to England, Belgium, France, Italy, Serbia, and Roumanian Government for the purchase of American food. The proposed appropriation would be entirely insufficient for these purposes. Might, however, later on be used to partially replace loans to Serbia and Roumania, but their urgent needs must in any event be cared for by the Treasury pending this appropriation. The matter is most urgent and forms the foundation for any complete arrangement with the allies fixing their participation. It would also furnish a large measure of relief to urgent surpluses, if prompt enough. There needs be great emphasis to all American officials and Congress that the armistice has left us large surplus of food that, if we are to dispose of it, we must give credits, and that, as the Nation trying to put peace on high-level ideals on which we went into war, we can not be niggardly in the world's greatest problem to-day—that is, How to get food. I need not repeat that strong liberal relief is to-day the only hope of stemming the tide of Bolshevism without the expenditure of lives and vast sums on military action. While it is urgently necessary to dispose of our surplus foods in order to relieve congestion and protect the producers from disaster and the consequent chaotic results, it is most fortunate for the saving of human lives that we have this surplus, and our country can not afford to fail to meet both emergencies.

HOOVER.

[Cablegram received Jan. 7, 1919, from Mr. Hoover.]

On area covered by new appropriation general situation of these countries is that their animals are largely reduced; their crops were far below normal, due to man and animal shortage, ravage, and cli-

matic conditions. The surplus harvest above absolute needs is now rapidly approaching exhaustion, and consequently the towns and cities are in dangerous situation. Our reports show specifically Finland that food is practically exhausted in cities; that while many of the peasants have some bread other sections are mixing large amount of straw; they are exhausted of fats, meats, sugar, and need help to prevent a renewed rise of bolshevism.

Baltic States: Food may last one or two months on much reduced scale; they sent deputation to our minister at Stockholm imploring food. Serbia: Town bread ration down 3 ounces daily in north; not accessible from Salonica. In south, where accessible, British are furnishing food to civil population; we are trying to get food in from Adriatic.

Jugo Slavia: Bread ration in many towns 3 or 4 ounces in all classes; short of fats, milk, and meat.

Vienna: Except for supplies furnished by Italians and Swiss, their present bread ration of 6 ounces per diem would disappear; large illness from shortage of fats, ration being 1½ ounces per week; no coffee, sugar, eggs; practically no meat.

Tyrol is being fed by Swiss charity.

Poland: Peasant probably have enough to get through; mortality in cities, particularly among children, appalling for lack of fats and milk, meat, bread; situation in bread will be worse in two months.

Roumania: Bread supply entire people estimated to last another 30 days; short of fats and milk; last harvest 60 per cent a failure.

Bulgaria: Harvest also a failure; supplies available, probably two or three months.

Armenia already starving.

Czecho-Slovaks: Large suffering; lack of fats and milk; have bread for two or three months; have sugar for six months. We have each country under investigation as to total amounts required to barely maintain life and their resources to pay. Preliminary investigation by Taylor and staff in connection with allied staffs show total above areas will require about 1,400,000 tons imported food to get through until next harvest, costing, say, \$350,000,000 delivered.

JANUARY 9, 1919.

Further telegraphic message from Dr. Alonzo Taylor, who represents us in interned food commission at Vienna. Taylor is assisted by Lieut. Col. Cansy and Capt. Gregory of our Army. The situation in Vienna is extremely bad. Flour ration is 5 ounces per day; fat ration is 2 ounces per week; meat ration is 3 ounces per week. People living mostly on cabbages and turnips. The stocks are very low; practically matter of days. Prices are fast all description. Unrationed butter, which can sometimes be obtained from illicit trade, is about \$6 per pound. The allied commission has decided that 30,000 tons of food-stuffs must be immediately provided. Of this the Italians offer to provide 15,000 tons for immediate shipment. Condition is urgent. Are we authorized to state that we will supply? There is no practicable finance in sight at the moment except to take undertakings of some of the banks.

AMERICAN MISSION.

STOCKHOLM, January 9, 1919.

SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington:

In connection with the proposed appropriation of \$100,000,000 by Congress to assist in food relief in Europe I feel you would like to have the food situation in Finland and the Baltic Provinces. With this in view have asked Norman Anderson, of Commerce Department, who is with legation in Stockholm, to compile facts and figures for me, which I quote below. This will show you urgent need of some of these countries for immediate relief: "Early Finnish grain, importation and production, less seed grain, was in terms flour and thousand metric tons beginning summer 1913, first year imports 414, production 431; second, 257 and 421; third, 346 and 468; fourth, 237 and 419; fifth, summer 1917 to December 1918, 13 and 391. Total crop this autumn estimated 609 metric tons, of which half oats and only 1 per cent wheat. To supply three and one quarter million population Finland with 300 grams flour daily per person Finland requires about 355,000 metric tons flour per year. Finnish Food Commission, Stockholm, estimates present stock flour Finland 246,000 metric tons consisting 71 per cent rye, 20 per cent barley, 7 per cent oats, and 2 per cent wheat. Shortage therefore flour of about 110,000 metric tons, equivalent to 129,000 metric tons grain which must be imported for this year's requirements; estimated needs for seed, and animals 461,000 metric tons, of which present stock Finland is about 200,000, and 160,000 metric tons must be imported. Total grain imports necessary this year's requirements for flour, seed, and animals about 29,000 metric tons. From 11,000 tons recently authorized from Scandinavia, about 2,000 tons already shipped to Finland. Grain stocks on hand in Finland do not tell true story of situation. Southeastern part of Finland agricultural and producers hold grain on hand for own consumption, estimated that about 2,000,000 of population produces and consumes most of food on hand. Helsingfors and western and northern regions, rocky soil and lakes, unproductive and always dependent on Russia for grain import long since cut off. Great deprivation in these districts. Bread consisting of oats, moss, and cellulose; very bad bread; ration, 80 grams daily, 40 grams extra for workers to million card holders.

"Urgent need in Finland for pork, sugar, fats, and dried fruits imports. Normal Finland produces about half pork requirements. No stock left, and this year's requirements pork estimated 25,000 metric tons, of which 5,000 to 10,000 needed immediately. No sugar on hand, and estimated year's requirements 15,000 metric tons. This year's requirements cocoa, fat and butter substitutes estimated 15,000 metric tons, and dried fruits 12,000 metric tons. Negotiations now under way to supply Finland with herring from Norway. Varying food conditions Baltic States comprising Esthonia, Courland, and Livland. Large stocks on hand Esthonia, which normally reports food plenty reported Revel at low prices; Esthonia stocks threatened, however, Bolshevik invasions; conditions may change any day. Livland and Courland normally self-supporting, but since war Russian German armies took available stocks. Germans have requisitioning 200,000 pounds, or 3,200 metric tons grain from Courland and Livland per month. Recently Bolsheviks taken and destroyed remaining stocks and reported conditions acute, especially in cities Riga, etc.; estimated food requirements, Baltic States, being prepared by Baltic States commission, Stockholm, will be cabled next day or two."

MORRIS.

PARIS, January 10, 1919.

SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington:

For Polk. Your 138, January 7, 8 p. m. Message to-day from Col. Atwood, United States Army, representative Hoover in Serbia and neighboring territory, states:

"Previous reports American naval officers on bad food conditions in Croatia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina are very conservative. British Army gotten through a relief train to Belgrade from Flume. We need two or three cargoes of mixed provisions at once. Admiral Bullard has secured for us necessary storage and stevedoring conditions. Both Navy and Army giving every possible assistance."

Please give copy to Food Administration.

LANSING,
American Mission, Paris.

PARIS, January 10, 1919.

SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington:

For Polk. With reference to your 138, January 7, 8 p. m. Commission comprising representatives four governments, among whom Dr. Alonzo Taylor, representing United States, received following telegram from Vienna:

"Allied representatives now authorized ship Austria 30,000 tons without regard to immediate financial arrangements. Italy offers 15,000 tons. Conditions very urgent."

AMERICAN MISSION.

PARIS, January 10, 1919.

SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington:

For Polk. Your 138, January 7, 8 p. m. Hoover has received following from American mission of investigation to Czecho-Slovakia, comprising Dr. Alonzo Taylor, Gibson, Capt. Gregory, and Dr. Kellogg. Begins:

"We recommend immediate supply to Czecho-Slovakia of another 6,000 tons of fat and 1,000 rice and 500 tons soap and 500 tons coffee and 30,000 tons of flour."

Seven thousand tons fat have been already arranged.

LANSING.

JANUARY 10, 1919.

Mr. Merrill, now making investigations in Serbia for the Government, telegraphs from Belgrade: "Essential food in most districts for present, but fear serious shortage in many places next month; prices high; bread 25 to 40 cents per pound and poor in cities suffering. Food minister says situation in Dalmatia most serious. America alone can handle situation."

AMERICAN MISSION.

PARIS, January 10, 1919.

SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington:

For Polk. Have following telegram, January 3, from Polish Government, Warsaw:

"In view of the famine in Lithuania, Silesia, and Lwow, in order to satisfy the minimum needs of the indigent population of all Poland with Lithuania, Silesia, 60,000 tons of flour are needed immediately. There is a need of 45,000 tons of flour per month in January and February and 30,000 tons of flour per month in March, April, May, June, and July, a total need of 300,000 tons of flour. The below-given indicated quantities must be comprised in the monthly needs. The duration of these monthly needs comprises eight months; that is, beginning with January until month of August, inclusively. Six thousand seven hundred fifty tons of peas, kidney beans, and oatmeal; 5,625 tons of sugar; 1,875 tons of rice; 8,400 tons of preserved meat, above all, lard; 2,250 tons of fish and herring; 600 tons of condensed milk; 15 tons of cheese; 180 tons of butter; 600 tons of vegetable and animal fats; 375 tons of tea; 90 tons of cocoa; 30 tons of pepper; 15 tons of saltpeter. In view of complete exhaustion of all storage, there is a need of clothing, shoes, and underwear for 10,000 inhabitants, counting per person a pair of shoes, 3 meters of material for clothing, and 6 meters of linen. There is a need of medicines and bandages. We will communicate to you on occasion the great necessary quantity of same. For the transport of the above-mentioned cargoes of the ports of Gdamsk, Krolewiec, and Libawa, 3,300 covered wagons and 110 locomotives are necessary.

"It is indispensable to give up as soon as possible to the Polish Government the railroads, with rolling stock: Gdamsk, Mlawa, Gdamsk, Toran, Libawa, Bialystok.

"Communication with the white Russian regions of Lithuania and Podalsie is impossible in view of the fact they are still invaded by the Germans, who clear the country of the last reserves and the Bolsheviks massacre the population."

LANSING,
American Mission, Paris.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has used 31 minutes, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] for 97½ minutes.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that any difference in the Committee on Appropriations has been brought to the floor of the House, certainly during this Congress, and for one I genuinely regret it. Of course there have been differences in the past, but we have buried them in the committee and united when we came onto the floor of the House. This time the division in the committee was very close, and I felt it my duty to oppose this proposition. My opposition is based fundamentally on two reasons: First, we have not the information sufficient to warrant this House in entering upon such a vast plan of future operations such as this; second, before the United States begins to act as the almoner of all Europe some arrangement should be made with our allies so that we should with harmony and with fairness amongst us all support these impoverished nations. Those are substantially the two reasons because of which I felt obliged to oppose this appropri-

tion. Up until now, as far as I remember, every request of the President has been granted. While the war lasted both sides of the House felt that the wishes of the administration should be their wishes, and when a request was made to us we granted it without much consideration. We sometimes felt, I think, that quite possibly some of these requests were cloaks to cover propositions not directly connected with the war, but we did not propose to take the risk of putting our suspicions into a negative vote, and we granted what was asked. Of course the most notable illustration that will come to every man's mind of that was the bill relating to the telegraphs, under which the cables were taken over after the armistice had been declared. I have no regret that I acted favorably upon all of the requests that were made. But now the war is over, now the emergency which compelled us not to make scrutiny and investigation has passed, and, although I am not from Missouri, from now on, when requests are made, I must be shown that they are reasonable, and I think that that is the proper attitude for the House to take. It is always true in case of war that vast powers are given to an Executive. History shows that one of the dangers to a Republic is that in time of war unreasonable powers are given to the Executive, which, in time of peace, are still desired and retained. Therefore when peace comes the good of the Republic requires that scrutiny should again be exercised, and that this House should legislate not simply because it is requested to legislate but upon its own motion.

Therefore I think it becomes us in the future to resume the functions which we abdicated practically for the time of the war, and I think the country expects that now this House will pass upon appropriation bills and other bills upon their merits, and that we shall have shown to us the facts upon which legislation shall be based. I was very much surprised that my friend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations should say a few moments ago that he did not think we ought to ask for further information. That differs greatly from his ordinary attitude toward appropriation bills. Why, what have we to support this? We have simply a cablegram from the President requesting us to pass this legislation and an echoing cablegram from one of his fellow members of the peace delegation. Those are all of the facts that we have. Why should we not have more? Why should we not be told what they presumably have before them? You say there is not time. We have had a delegation in Europe investigating this for several months. This whole subject has been investigated in cooperation with the other powers of Europe, and yet Congress is absolutely in the dark. We do not know how much famine is oppressing the nations of Europe. We do not know where they need the food. We do not know whether this \$100,000,000 will tide us all through or whether it is just the first one hundred million and we have to follow it on with hundreds of millions after this. And before we embark upon what may be a policy which will cost this Government a billion of dollars, I think we ought to wait until the facts from Mr. Hoover or his agent or whoever has been made the investigators shall have come over here. They should have come over in time to inform us when this proposition was first before us. There is going to be delay because of the President's absence, because he did not appoint anybody to perform his duties while he is gone, and for that reason it is going to take an extra week before this bill can become a law, and when one coordinate branch of our Government is out of the country engaged in world affairs it is peculiarly imperative that one of the other branches of the Government should look out for the interests of America. And I think now that the war is over we are expected to give some attention to economy.

Mr. MANN rose.

Mr. GILLETT. Does the gentleman wish to interrupt me?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman referred to the question of time. We passed a bill in reference to the transportation of clerks home. It was presented to the White House on December 19 last. The authorities received a cablegram on January 10 that the President had signed the bill. The gentleman referred to a week. There was a matter about which there was no controversy, and the time elapsed was from December 19 to January 10.

Mr. GILLETT. Of course, that increases the strength of my argument, but it also emphasizes the feeling which a good many people have, that before the President went over he ought to have appointed somebody to perform his functions, and while he is away it does not mean we are to accept every cabled request without investigating it fundamentally. Now, the Members want to appreciate that this bill is the exercise of an entirely new function by Congress.

It is the function of feeding a starving world. The constitutional power, I suppose, would be greatly doubted, especially

by that side of the House. We have once or twice, in the case of Martinique and in the case of Italy, granted appropriations which were mere benefactions; but as a rule we have recognized in this country that when charity was to be performed it was to be done not by the Government but by the people of the United States, and such an organization as the Red Cross, such an organization as has recently been formed to assist the Armenians, those have been the agencies by which charity is to be performed. Now, when we are entering on a phase of charity greater than this world has ever dreamed of before, when we are going to say we will feed the hungry of the whole southwest of Europe, we ought to be deliberate and have the facts put before us. Why, my friend said that there is only one way to stop the spread of Bolshevism, and that is food. Now, if we knew that food would stop the spread of Bolshevism, that certainly would be a tremendous argument in its favor; but it is a mere assumption—

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. No; I can not yield; others want time and I am compelled to speak in haste. That is a mere assumption. Of course, hunger and suffering of any kind always makes a person discontented with the existing government; but upon that theory, giving of food to Russia would make Russia satisfied with existing government, which is the Bolsheviki, and it would make Poland satisfied with the existing government.

Now, just how extreme this famine is, just what sections of Europe need to be covered, I do not know, and we ought to know. Why, my friend speaks about the allies supplying them now. They are supplying them, if I understood it correctly, out of the Army stores, and the United States is doing that to-day. The United States is sending to Italy and to the east Adriatic Army stores and supplies. That is against the law. But I do not criticize them. If the necessity demands it, let them do it; but there is a great distinction between supplying foreign governments from Army stores and making a vast appropriation of \$100,000,000 for it, and, personally, I think before we enter upon that there ought to be an absolute agreement among the different nations of the world about the policy that shall be followed, about when and where and how it shall be distributed, and about the proportions which the different nations shall contribute. I do not want to be mean about it.

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield—

Mr. GILLETT. No; I can not. I am willing that the United States shall grant much more than its full quota, and I think our country is disposed to be generous, that it would be glad to give more than its share, but we want to have it understood that there is an agreement among the nations, and we do not want to do it in a way which will make our allies discontented. Now, I suspect—I suspect that this is not an allied proposition; that it is a United States proposition alone. The suggestions about keeping up the price of food are a commingling of commerce and charity. Are we doing this for charity or for the food products of the United States? If it is charity, as I think it ought to be, let us not combine it with something else; let us have it understood and have our motives justly suspected. There are suspicions—you have all read them in the papers—there are suspicions that jealousies have grown up between the United States Food Administrator and the food administrators of the allies, and that the allies think that the United States is trying to be too prominent and trying to get too much of the credit of the distribution.

I do not suppose our allies will object to our giving all we please. Of course, they would like to have us give more than our quota—and I think we are willing to do so—but I think when we are entering on this enormous problem—this problem of furnishing food to the suffering of Europe—we want first to have the full cooperation and sympathy of our allies. I think what ought to have been done and what ought to be done now is to have our delegates at the peace conference agree, or our President agree with the leading men of France and Great Britain and Italy, upon some plan by which this distribution shall be made, and agree in general upon the proportion in which the different countries shall subscribe to it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. There has been an agreement by England, France, Italy, and the United States that this food distribution shall be by distribution at which each shall have its representatives.

Mr. GILLETT. But there is no agreement, so far as we are advised, as to the extent of it, as to the amount the different nations shall contribute, or as to anything about repayment. Has there been any such agreement?

Mr. SHERLEY. There has been no agreement as to the definite amount, except the statement that the allies were prepared to give their portion of it.

Mr. GILLETT. Where is that?

Mr. SHERLEY. I read it, or, if I did not, I will do so.

Mr. GILLETT. Do you mean it is in the hearing?

Mr. SHERLEY. I mean I read it here on the floor. I have a cablegram here, which I will pass over to the gentleman, that contains that.

Mr. GILLETT. Just a vague statement that they are prepared to do their share is not what I want. We ought to have, it seems to me, an agreement as to how and in what proportion the different nations shall combine. The natural way, I should think, but I may be quite wrong about it, is that when supplying food to one of these suffering nations we should take the notes and obligations of those nations, and then the allied nations practically indorse them jointly, so that in time, if they ever can repay it, the allies as a whole would be repaid. Some such system as that ought to be inaugurated. At any rate, before we are called upon to enter upon this vast new program I think there ought to be, first, information, some developed information, not a mere telegram saying it is needed; and then there ought to be some program which will extend into the future upon which the vastness of this whole intention shall be measured and conceived and prepared, so that we will know what we are undertaking.

Mr. DILLON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. I can not yield. The gentleman will excuse me.

One word more. The gentleman says bolshevism must stop. We all appreciate that, and yet bolshevism probably can not be stopped. It is spreading westward. I confess I think that anyone who has the ear of Europe could do no better service to his country and to the world than in not merely saying always what is agreeable to those he is talking to but occasionally dropping a timely and healthy suggestion that freedom involves responsibilities and duties as well as blessings [applause] and to suggest that the obligations of freedom mean the obligations of law and order, and that no nation and no people are fit for freedom who do not respect the rights of others as well as their own. And so it seems to me that we could perhaps meet bolshevism occasionally by an argument as well as with food. But we have no assurance that food is going to stop bolshevism. It is entirely an assumption. Of course, it makes a plausible argument. But this is just a practical question: Shall the United States Congress appropriate \$100,000,000 without knowing for what it is to be spent in any detail at all and not knowing how much our allies will cooperate? Those are the two grounds on which I oppose this resolution.

It is disagreeable, of course, to oppose any proposition for charity. The popular side is always to say, "Here are famine-stricken sufferers; will you not relieve them?" and, of course, everybody says "Yes." And the people of the United States, I am sure, want to relieve suffering, as everybody in this House does. The people of the United States will contribute out of their own pockets, if not out of the United States Treasury. If it is necessary to contribute out of the United States Treasury they will gladly do that. But before they do it I believe they want to know the facts upon which it is based, and they want to know what the other nations of Europe, with whom we are in alliance and who are equally responsible, will do. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time the gentleman has used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has used 14 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] use some of his time.

Mr. GILLETT. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. As a member of the Appropriations Committee I voted against this measure, and nothing has occurred since it was reported to the House to change my opinion. As has already been stated, it is not a popular thing to oppose a measure that has for its purpose the distribution of alms to those who are starving. But it occurs to me that we should reach a point presently where we should distribute our charity with some degree of intelligence and where we have some idea as to the character of program that is to be pursued in the distribution.

If these hearings have amounted to anything they have informed us that this is just a beginning. When the end will be nobody knows. There is no information in these hearings with

reference to the extent of that suffering, or where we should commence or the amount we should distribute here or there or yonder. All of that we are told must be left to the discretion of this newly organized body for the distribution of food upon the other side.

And here is a thing that strikes me as being a little strange, and perhaps some of the rest of you will have the same impression. The Red Cross is organized now, if you please, as it has never been organized before in the history of the world—an agency whose purpose, and prime purpose, is to relieve the suffering of the world.

They are organized all through that country which they say is affected and where they say the starvation exists. We have had no report for our edification gathered by the Red Cross. There has come no word from this great agency that they are not able to cope with the emergency. There has come no cry for relief from them.

Where does it come from? It comes, if you please, from a new organization that has been formed within a month. And who is at the head of that organization? Mr. Hoover. It is Mr. Hoover that is asking for this appropriation and not the President of the United States. The President of the United States is merely the medium conveying to the Congress the desire of Mr. Hoover, and the President of the United States was frank to say so in the telegram that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] read to the committee, wherein he said he hoped he [Mr. SHERLEY] would use all of his power to obtain the appropriation asked for by Mr. Hoover.

Now, then, gentlemen may differ with me with reference to Mr. Hoover. I think he is the most expensive luxury that was ever fastened upon this country. I think he will continue to be the most expensive luxury with which we have to do if we still continue to give him unlimited power.

It has been said that we ought to congratulate ourselves because of the fact that we have an American at the head of this distributing committee. I deny that we have an American at the head of this distributing committee. He is an expatriated former citizen of the United States and he has never found it necessary to become repatriated. He did not come here in our midst during these trying days as a representative of the United States Government, to act and give his services for the benefit of the people of the United States. He came here as the agent of the allies, as their purchaser of food and food supplies, and that was long before we entered into this war. When we entered into it he was selected as the Food Administrator. Did Mr. Hoover resign his position as the purchasing agent of the allies for food supplies? No. He maintained that agency throughout and is occupying it now. Most paradoxical, these two positions. I dare say that the American people expected that he was their agent, solely and alone. He was not their agent except as it was to his interest to be their agent, he representing primarily the interests of the allies. Never before was such a paradoxical position of such great importance occupied by any man in the history of this country. Therefore I say there is reason for having more light and information on the subject when we are informed by the President of the United States who it is who is asking for this \$100,000,000.

It has been said that there is no one who can point to a single item of misuse of power on the part of this man Hoover. I expect that when the final scrutiny comes, when the echoes of war have ceased to sound, when judgment reigns supreme again and reason has its sway and investigation is made to inform the people of the facts to which they are entitled, much can be said of the transactions of Mr. Hoover. As I said, and as I repeat again, if we had had an American citizen of the United States, interested with the citizens of the United States, at the head of this great food-supply business of the United States there would be a better feeling in this country, at least, and a belief in the minds of the American people that their interests were the prime interests in the mind of that Food Administrator. But when we know that every breath that he drew was drawn as the agent of the allies, and when we know that in every purchase he made he was acting primarily in the interest of the allies, and only secondarily in the interest of the United States, I think it is passing strange that the first cry that we hear coming from the other side asking that we contribute \$100,000,000 comes not from the agency that we have trusted and found true in every respect for the relief of suffering over there—the Red Cross—but it comes from the man who has just suddenly gone over and had himself placed at the head of that institution, as he had himself placed at the head of the institution here, when it is only his secondary purpose to serve the interests of the United States in the position to which he is now appointed, because his prime object is to further the interests of the allies. This is the same unbiased gentleman who proclaimed through

the public press on the day before the election last November that through the election of a Democratic Congress the President will not only save the lives of a million American boys and countless innocent women and children, but will enable him to attain a more complete "victory and a more permanent guaranty for peace than by any other means." This statement should be sufficient to condemn him in the minds of all men as being unfit for a responsible position of trust.

Now, it has been suggested here, if you please, that this money is to be expended for the most part in purchasing food supplies in the United States. The hearings do not bear out that assertion. The hearings, what little there is on that subject—

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Has the Government heretofore appropriated money for the Red Cross, or has that organization been voluntarily supported?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. So far as I know that has been voluntarily supported.

Mr. HARDY. And it has never asked money from the Government?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. No; and it is the exception when the Government is called upon to appropriate for charitable uses. Generally, when cries come for the relief of other nations, the people themselves take it upon themselves, through the Red Cross or some other agency of that kind, to raise the relief required. It is the greatest exception when the United States Government has done it. I suppose half a dozen times would cover all the times it has done it. There is no warrant of law authorizing it at any time, and if we pass this measure it will be without authority of law.

But I refer to the Red Cross for the reason that they have an agency everywhere. They are supposed to know all about the subject, the places where there is suffering; and if we propose to pass this bill in spite of there being no law to warrant it, and we want to get the greatest value possible for our money, why can we not give it to the Red Cross for distribution?

Mr. HARDY. Is not the Red Cross now urging in the most vigorous terms the passage of this bill?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have not heard of it. In the last Red Cross drive they got more than \$100,000,000, when it was expected that this war would last a year or two longer, and they have got much of that money still unexpended. But whether they have much money or little money, I think it would have been wise—at least it would have furnished information for this committee—to have heard something from that agency. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] 40 minutes of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Forty minutes or forty-seven minutes?

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield to the gentleman 40 minutes, and if I find myself able to do so I will be glad to give him additional time.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] 10 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to minimize the force of the arguments that have been made in opposition to this measure. I shall support the measure with my voice and my vote, not in ignorance or denial of the force of those arguments, but because, after due consideration of them, while I find them persuasive, I do not find them conclusive or convincing.

I wish it were true that, having as representatives of the American people on their behalf assumed a tremendous responsibility in the world war, we had arrived at a condition where we might now honestly and conscientiously assume that responsibility had been discharged. We have not reached that condition. I wish it were true that having put our hands to the plow we had reached the end of the furrow and might properly turn back. I wish it were true that the signing of the armistice had brought peace and plenty, prosperity, and security in Europe, but it has not. We know—all the world knows—that famine gaunt and stark, attended by every horrid form of pestilence, marches on the receding waves of carnage, while crime and violence and all the devils of anarchy fatten and flourish in their wake. And what are we going to do about it? Deny our responsibility? Assume that we are in no wise further obligated over there? I wish that we might honorably do that. I am no more pleased than other gentlemen are with what I consider the pernicious practice of making sight drafts on Congress without notice or explanation. But we have been

long accustomed to that practice. We should have become accustomed to it before now. This, however, is true: We have flung tens of billions of dollars into the cavernous maw of war in the past 18 months with less information as to the details of plans and purposes than we have touching this matter. So far as the major controlling and appalling facts of the situation are concerned, we are informed—all the world is informed. They are brought to us by every pulsation of the sound waves, by every click of the cables. We have 2,000,000 boys over there, and the heart of the Nation pines to have them home. If the appropriation of this sum of money, trifling compared with the billions we have heretofore appropriated—intended, at least, whether it accomplishes it or not, to stay the progress of famine and pestilence and the spread of anarchy—shall by one day hasten the homecoming of those boys, if it shall in any degree remove the danger and menace that our boys may be called upon to engage in the distasteful task of restoring order amid the chaos of eastern Europe, it will have been the best spent \$100,000,000 we have appropriated since the war began. [Applause.]

I am not supporting this measure out of full and complete approval of presidential peregrinations, plans, or policies. Far from it. But I decline to take advantage of this measure in order to emphasize those disagreements. The President, under the Constitution, is our spokesman in the inauguration and the negotiation of the terms of peace. He has seen fit, in the carrying out of that duty, to bring himself in personal contact with the men charged with like responsibility in Europe. That is his affair. That is his responsibility. As our spokesman, as our voice on the watchtower, as the representative of America in the peace negotiations he has said to us that, in his opinion, our responsibilities under the conditions as he finds them require the expenditure of the sum we are asked to appropriate.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. My time is limited, but I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What connection has this appropriation of \$100,000,000 with what the United States is asking for from the peace commission?

Mr. MONDELL. If this appropriation of \$100,000,000 shall relieve hunger, thereby giving people an opportunity to think sanely, and so shall stay the march of anarchy, it will have been the wisest and sanest appropriation we have made since the war began. [Applause.] I hope that in addition to relieving distress and pain and misery among men it may smooth the pathways of peace. [Applause.]

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MONDELL. Briefly.

Mr. IGOE. What does the gentleman think of the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], that the way to appease the hunger of these people is to stop them and argue with them and write them letters and notes?

Mr. MONDELL. I am rather inclined to feed them first. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, just one thing more. I do not altogether agree with the President. While he talks wisely and well of democracy, his attitude toward communications with Congress savors strongly of autocracy. But whether we agree with him or not, under the Constitution he is charged with a great responsibility. When the war began I stated that while the war lasted and until peace came I should consider it my duty to resolve the doubts I had in matters directly connected with the war in favor of the view of those charged with executive authority. I do not believe I shall be wholly relieved from the obligation of duty until around the peace table it shall be determined what our duties and responsibilities are touching the situation in Europe. Until that time comes I shall to a large extent resolve my doubts in these matters in favor of the view of the responsible executives of the Government, who in this case is the President himself. I decline to take the responsibility of in any degree or in any wise embarrassing or lessening the influence of America at the peace table by declining to accede to this request of the President of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I want to call attention to the observation made originally by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL], and repeated by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], to the effect that the United States Government and Congress appropriated hundreds of millions and billions of dollars simply for the purpose of killing and slaying people. I think that is the worst slander on the American Congress that I have ever heard on the floor of this House. We were assured by the President of the United

States that the rights of citizens on the high seas had been unlawfully invaded, and those of us who voted for those appropriations voted to vindicate the sovereignty of the Nation and not for the purpose of killing and slaying. All of the evidence that we have heard in support of the resolution has been discovered outside of the hearings and in the testimony of persons who have no actual knowledge on the subject.

The President of the United States, in his communication to Congress, says this, and I read it:

I wish to appeal to the great sense of charity and good will of the American people toward the suffering, and to place this act primarily on a humanitarian basis.

Anything there about the Bolsheviki? Anything there about the necessity of this as a means of bringing about peace? Of course, gentlemen had no legitimate reasons in support of this measure and so they had to manufacture some. [Laughter.] The real truth about it is, and the theory upon which they have reported this resolution is, that by feeding the faces of the Bolsheviki you can bring about peace the terms of which lie and his commissioners are in Europe to negotiate.

Now, the nations that have been engaged in this war are quite as much, in proportion to their resources, interested in bringing about peace as the Government of the United States, but if the argument of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL] is sound, then the argument in support of all the peace commissioners adopting resolutions, as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT], in behalf of all nations of Europe represented in the peace conference is sound, because if this is a peace proposition it ought to be vouched for by all the nations of Europe in the peace conference. Every one of the allied nations is represented there by their leading representative men. They are authorized to speak on this question. If that conference had adopted a resolution that this sum, or any other sum, is necessary and the nations would join in it and fix any proportion they might as the just proportion of the United States, I would vote the last dollar, and do it willingly and freely. If we had that statement from all of those charged with the responsibility of making peace that it was necessary, I would vote for it. But we have nothing but telegrams intended to drag this thing through Congress. I challenge any man in support of the resolution to state one scintilla of competent evidence that France, Italy, or England has appropriated one dollar in support of this purpose, or have agreed to do so.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that Italy has fed the whole Serbian Army after the retreat, and sent food to Albania and food to Montenegro?

Mr. GORDON. That has nothing to do with this case, but was during the war, when Italy was getting licked and fed Serbia's soldiers for helping her. [Laughter and applause.] As I say, the hearings in this case disclose that Italy has not contributed one cent—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is not correct.

Mr. GORDON. For this purpose, and if the gentleman will read the hearings he will know more about this case than he does now.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am stating facts.

Mr. GORDON. But, gentlemen, we ought to consider this question properly. I repeat that there is not a scintilla of competent evidence that any one of these three nations has contributed, or agreed to contribute, one single dollar in support of this proposition.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I stated that I held here in my hand, and I read from it and I will put it in the Record, a cablegram from the American representatives abroad to the effect that England, France, and Italy had agreed to bear their proper share and that they were actually sending foodstuffs—

Mr. GORDON. Through the army.

Mr. SHERLEY. And that they are actually transporting food for relief of these people. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLETT. That is through the army.

Mr. GORDON. All through the army. Now, I took down that part of the cablegram that the gentleman read from Mr. White. Of course, a telegram from the peace commissioners, headed by Woodrow Wilson, would have more weight, but I took down what the gentleman from Kentucky read from Mr. White.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes; briefly.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman said he would accept a telegram from the peace commission. Are not the cablegrams that the gentleman from Kentucky read from the American peace commission?

Mr. GORDON. Oh, I object; I will make my own speech. I say, gentlemen, that the representatives of the European nations ought to take up this proposition if it is so momentous as is represented to us. I say if this obligation rests on the nations which have prosecuted this war and which have prosecuted it to final victory, the same obligation rests on them in proportion to the ability and power and resources as rests on the United States. I say to you that the ground on which the President of the United States placed the proposition in the telegram upon which the resolution was based, which was reported out of the Appropriations Committee, placed it solely on the ground of charity and good will.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Speaking about the contributions from Italy, the American Red Cross appropriated in Italy \$3,583,826 and in Great Britain \$1,885,750.

Mr. GORDON. We have had starvation in Italy ever since it got into the war. They could not feed themselves, to say nothing about feeding outside nations. I want to call attention to the fact that ever since we got into the war we have been underwriting the bonds of these nations.

I am willing to underwrite them some more, if it is necessary, for the purpose the gentlemen ask here, to wit, that you will not have any peace unless you feed these people. If that is so, then the obligation rests equally upon all of the allied nations, together with us, to feed them. I am willing to furnish the food, but I do say, as a matter of self-respect, the American Government ought to insist that an obligation, which is certainly equal upon each of these allied nations, ought to be recognized, and it ought to be recognized before we vote this \$100,000,000. That is what I say, and there is no answer to that. The observations made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] have not been answered, and they can not be answered within the truth. These beautiful statements that, so far as they are able and find it convenient, these nations will undoubtedly do their share are exceedingly indefinite, and are statements upon which I would refuse to bind this Nation in the first instance. The matter was placed originally upon the ground of mere charity. What about the hundreds of millions that have been donated to the Red Cross? What was that donated for? Why did this Congress authorize national bank officers to take money out of their treasuries and donate it to the Red Cross, if it was not upon the theory that the doing out of charity was not a public function, as Mr. Hoover says it is, but was a purely private function, which individuals themselves must be relied upon to perform. That is the theory upon which everyone has been donating to the Red Cross. It is the theory upon which appeals have been made for the Red Cross ever since the war started—that donating to charitable purposes is not a Government function. Hoover is the man who discovered it was a Government function, and in passing we have been challenged to point to anything in the record of Mr. Hoover that has not tended to the benefit of the United States. Well, Hoover, as has been observed, was the purchasing agent for the allied nations to come over here to buy wheat. The Government of the United States put the monopoly of purchasing, along with the embargo, in his hands, so that he could fix the price of wheat, and he fixed it, and when complaint was made to him by a Member of the House that other grains were going up out of all proportion, including corn, he said, "You give me the right to fix the railroad rates and I will bring these rates down." That is to say, by the imposition of confiscatory railroad rates he could make the price of corn in Iowa \$1 a bushel, in Nebraska 50 cents. In Missouri he could fix it at \$1 and in Kansas at 50 cents. That is the power that Mr. Hoover wanted, but that is one of the powers that he did not get from Congress. The burden is upon those who undertake here—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, the opposition to this bill is based on several grounds. One is that we have not sufficient information. Our good and explosive friend from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] a few moments ago asked for information coming from any source other than Mr. Hoover that the allies are cooperating in this work, and I then asked him to yield in order that I might read him this statement contained in the cable from the American mission.

Mr. KEARNS. What American mission?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The American peace mission. It sends this cable, and the chairman of the Committee on

Appropriations had it with his cables there, and I picked it out from among them a moment ago:

All of the relief to Serbia has been and is contributed by England. England is also sending to Roumania two cargoes of flour and contributions have already been made by Italy.

The President of the United States has in his message said that there is an agreement between the allied nations to cooperate in this work. Mr. Hoover has in his cable said that the allied nations are committed to it. This cable says they are not only committed to it but the allies, without waiting for this Congress to act, have gone ahead with this work and are proceeding to relieve starvation, while the American Congress, or some part of it, hesitates and asks, as my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] did, that a treaty be arranged among the nations in order to cover this. I presume he would ask that that treaty be arranged and then sent to the Senate for ratification, and in the meantime the people of Europe should be allowed to starve.

Mr. GILLETT. I did not suggest a treaty.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The gentleman says nothing should be done until the peace commissioners get together and agree. Then to bind this country it would be submitted to the Senate, and in the meantime the people would starve.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Who signed that paper?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is a cable from the American peace commission. So signed. My good friend from Ohio, Dr. FESS, stated one minute that he would refuse to vote to spend the money of the people of his district unless he received an indorsement or a direction from them, and in the very next minute he declared, in winding up his remarks, that if the Red Cross were intrusted with this work he would vote for it. The only objection is as to the method by which this proposed fund shall be used.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I can not yield unless the gentleman states that I am misquoting him.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman is misquoting me.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I will state to the gentleman from Ohio that I am, or used to be, a shorthand writer, and I took down his statement at the time, and if he looks at his manuscript he will see that he said that if the Red Cross handled this fund he would vote for it.

Mr. FESS. I said that, but I did not say that if I were instructed from my district—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. What was the gentleman's language?

Mr. FESS. I said that I would not vote out of the Treasury money that was paid out of my district; that I would be willing to allow the people of my district to give, but I would not give their gift.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. That is a differentiation without any difference. The taxes of the people who live in the district represented by the gentleman go into the Treasury.

Mr. FESS. That is different from what I said.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. But he would not vote unless he got some direction. It is quibbling. The gentlemen who oppose this resolution are seeking for excuses. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOP] spoke about the War Trade Board and the appropriation of \$5,000,000 in a lump sum from the President to that board to organize a corporation. Not one cent of that has been spent.

The War Trade Board assisted in the organization of the corporation because it could not conduct that work. By agreement of the allied council the nations acting independently were to engage in this work, and this corporation was to go into Siberia and exchange food for commodities, such as furs, that those people own and which they could not bring to this country. When the armistice came they gave up the idea of carrying on work of that kind, and the only work—

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. And the only work of that corporation was to aid the War Department in furnishing food supplies to the Czecho-Slovaks who helped us in the war. I believe, gentlemen of the House, that the Republicans on the Committee on Rules—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. One more minute.

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina (continuing). The Republicans on the Rules Committee did not properly represent the Republican side of this House, and that the Republicans in this House will follow the Americanism of those gentlemen who stand here to-day in support of the President's request to aid the starving people of Europe. My good friend from Ohio says we should not attempt to destroy the Bolsheviks. My good

friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] says we should argue with them; we should not give them food. What argument would he make to starving men? The question is largely one of how we should treat that subject. Shall we handle it with force? By force Bolshevism can not be stopped; by food it may be stopped. You can win more of those people to stable government to-day with bread than you can with bullets.

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. We have won the war, but we have not yet won peace. We can not hope to do so until stable governments exist where chaos and disorder now exist. The allied representatives believe that by contributions of food reason may return to those disordered peoples. Shall we refuse the appropriation and run the risk of forcing our boys in France to remain there for an indefinite period?

Mr. FOCHT. Will the gentleman yield for me to ask a question?

Mr. GILLETT. I yield the gentleman a minute.

Mr. FOCHT. If I am correct, the gentleman said there was an agreement between the United States and the allied countries of Europe in regard to this matter. May I not ask the gentleman whether he does not believe it is high time the President or the commission or somebody of the so-called representatives of this country submitted to the American Congress these agreements, especially since the election on November 5?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is now submitted.

Mr. FOCHT. What does the gentleman think about—

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I say it is now submitted to you. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FOCHT. Where is it?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. It is here in this cable.

Mr. FOCHT. The gentleman refused to give the names signed to the telegram.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. I stated that it was the American peace commission.

Mr. FOCHT. Who is that?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. If the gentleman is so uninformed that he does not know who constitutes the American peace commission, it is useless to waste time in telling him.

Mr. FOCHT. Nobody else knows much about them, because we did not have anything to do with appointing them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest the gentleman from Massachusetts use some of his time.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it is a poor cause that calls to its support vituperation and misrepresentation. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL] devoted the largest part of his remarks to denouncing the Republican members of the Committee on Rules as being wholly destitute of compassion, and he called upon the Republican Members of this side to repudiate them as being entirely unwilling to contribute anything to relieve suffering and starvation. Mr. Chairman, I know not what could have inspired this remark and why the further charge should have been made that those gentlemen were playing politics, except that the gentleman himself was smarting under the party lash administered by the party leader to drive him to this course. What is this awful crime with which the Republican members of the Committee on Rules was charged? What was their terrible conduct? That they were unwilling to relieve suffering and distress? No. They were as much willing to relieve it as the gentleman from Kentucky or any other man in this House.

What, then, was this misconduct on their part? It is that they were unwilling that the money of the American people, \$100,000,000 of their money, should be spent without their knowing where and how it was going. They wanted to know in what countries this money was to be expended. They were unwilling in time of peace to grant powers that under such conditions had never before been given to kaiser or emperor. This is the whole of their offense. And what is it that the gentleman from Kentucky and some others on that side plume themselves so much upon? The great generosity of being willing to give away other people's money without knowing how it is to be expended or what was to be done with it. I confess that I can not get enthusiastic over liberality of that kind. I would rather know something about what is to be done with this fund before I vote for it. Mr. Chairman, we have had an unfortunate experience with these enormous appropriations which have been voted without let or hindrance; to be expended without any restriction, but we voted them under stress of war, in an emergency, under press of circumstances. While the war was in doubt, while the Germans were thundering

at the gates of Paris, we had that for an excuse, but we have no excuse for such a course at this time. We have every reason, on the contrary, to say that now that the war is over, as the President himself has said, that these lump appropriations, voted to be expended entirely in the discretion of the person who expends them, should now stop. Gentlemen have said—

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not yield. I only have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Gentlemen have said we are lowering the influence of the President in Europe by opposing this appropriation. Mr. Chairman, I have heard many criticisms upon the President, some of which I indorsed and some that I did not, but I never heard it intimated until gentlemen on that side, the Democratic side of the aisle, brought it up that he was a man of so little ability and so little credit that he could not transact the duty of a peace commissioner unless he was given \$100,000,000 to spend as he pleased. That is the position in which gentlemen on the other side are putting the President. It is not this side that is belittling him. It is the other side who say that unless he can have \$100,000,000 he can not discharge the functions of a peace commissioner. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I would gladly support this bill if there was any check upon the expenditure which it authorizes. I would support it if the money was to be handled by the Red Cross, for this would give a check and balance by passing through its hands and would make use of that organization instead of requiring another to be created. As it stands, this immense sum will be expended with no check and no audit, except to find that it was authorized by the President. I can not approve the bill in that form, but I suppose it is hopeless to expect any amendments will be permitted. Gentlemen on the other side are determined that Congress shall relinquish all control over this fund, and, so far as this money is concerned, completely abdicate its functions, relinquish its powers, and abandon its duties.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am in favor of this bill. [Applause.] I hesitated to favor it. When the proposal was first made the objections to the bill seemed in my mind to be greater than the necessities for the appropriation. Those objections, so far as my own attitude toward the bill is concerned, have not disappeared, but in spite of the objections, which I think I hold at their full value, the necessities require me to vote for this bill. It is not uncommon that I find myself forced to advocate one side or another of a question when there are good reasons on both sides. I do not think, either, that it is an unfortunate state of mind. I want to be able to see both sides of the question, and I do not want good reasons on one side to paralyze my mind when I consider the good reasons on the other side.

I would like to have more information as to the machinery that is to handle this appropriation. I should like to have more information as to the restrictions that are to be placed upon this expenditure. I do not need any more information as to the necessity for the relief of those people. We know what the condition of Europe is. We know that starvation threatens. This is a matter of common knowledge, about which we do not need to take special expert testimony. The men that are in the best position to know tell us that probably in those parts of Russia that we can not reach even after we pass this bill millions will die of starvation. Mr. Hoover, for whose opinion on such subjects I have great regard, estimates that perhaps 10,000,000 people will die of starvation even if we pass this bill, because we can not reach them. Millions more will starve if we refuse to pass this bill and nobody else takes up the burden that we refuse to place upon our own shoulders. Other people will take it up if we lay it down, but that will not meet our responsibility.

England and France, we are assured by Mr. Rickard, of the Food Administration, have done now in the relief of Belgium twice as much as the United States has done. We have done much. We are highly praised by the people for whom we have done it. We must not forfeit their good opinion by claiming that we have done it all. We must not boast of our generosity. There was work to be done in the world, and we undertook to do our share of it, so far as the knowledge of the necessities could be brought to our people. And the people were liberal. But we did not know the necessities as fully as the men and women of France and England knew them. They were passing under their eyes. We have not done as much as they have done, but I do believe if the necessity had continued, with the information that was being disseminated in this country and with our in-

creasing understanding of the needs, that all we had would have been at the disposal of the allies and ourselves in this war if necessity had required.

Now, the great expenditures of the war have been passed. We have saved billions by the unexpected shortening of the period of hostilities. We ought not to throw our money away because we have saved what we did not expect to save. That is a spendthrift policy. When it is intended to spend money for one purpose and the expenditure is found to be unnecessary, the money should not burn a hole in our pocket merely because it is unspent. This is a characteristic of the spendthrift. But this expenditure is needed. We have the money. And to hold the place that our generosity and our very practical idealism have won for us in the world, we ought to continue to bear our share of the burden.

The purpose for which the money is needed is exceedingly well known. It is not to be spent in Germany. It is not a gift. It is not an appropriation of \$100,000,000 to be given away. It is an appropriation to establish a revolving fund to be used in the purchase and distribution of food. That food is to be sold and paid for if the consumers are able to pay for it.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I will.

Mr. GORDON. We have such a revolving fund now, and have had it for several years, under the administration of Mr. Hoover.

Mr. TEMPLE. Not for this purpose.

Mr. GORDON. Of course not. You can not give it away, but you can sell it. The purpose of this is solely to give it away, and it is the only purpose of it.

Mr. TEMPLE. The language of the bill provides:

That expenditures hereunder shall be reimbursed, so far as possible, by the Governments, or subdivisions thereof, or the peoples to whom relief is furnished.

Here is the language that describes the use to which the money may be put:

One hundred million dollars, which may be used as a revolving fund until June 30, 1919, and which shall be audited, where practicable, in the same manner as other expenditures of the Government.

Now, what are the other safeguards? In the first place, the main safeguard is that the funds shall be audited—and I intend to move an amendment to that—shall be audited, where practicable, in the same manner as other expenditures of the Government are audited. I would strike out the words "where practicable," and make it read:

Shall be audited in the same manner as other expenditures of the Government are audited.

I want that change to be made in the bill if possible. Another safeguard is that the expenditures made under this bill are to be reimbursed so far as possible by the Governments or subdivisions thereof, or the peoples to whom relief is furnished. In good faith, let us understand that. It says "reimbursed so far as possible." It can not be a revolving fund unless reimbursements are made. I imagine that the fund will diminish, that the amount that is revolving will decrease, but the President's telegram says the total shipments of foodstuffs will amount to one and one-half billion dollars, and the minimum sum to handle it is \$100,000,000. Well, you can not make purchases and sales of \$1,500,000,000 worth of food out of \$100,000,000, or even \$400,000,000, as it will be if Italy, England, and France contribute a like amount. The fund must be a revolving fund. The food purchased must be sold if it is to move that amount of food under the intention expressed here.

A further safeguard is found in the requirement of the last proviso of the bill:

Provided further, That a report of the receipts and expenditures under this appropriation shall be submitted to Congress not later than the first day of the next regular session.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. TEMPLE. For a short question.

Mr. DILLON. Does the gentleman understand that the famine-stricken people in this bill would include Armenians and Turks and Bulgars? We are not at war with those countries.

Mr. TEMPLE. The President's telegram says:

While the Secretary of the Treasury can accept obligations of certain Governments and through these measures their situations can be cared for temporarily, there are still other areas through eastern and southern Europe where such arrangements can not be made. This applies more particularly to the liberated peoples of Austria, Turkey, Poland, and western Russia.

Mr. DILLON. Does that apply to Bulgaria?

Mr. TEMPLE. So far as the language of the bill is concerned, there is nothing in it that would prevent the application to Bulgaria.

Mr. ROGERS. Does the gentleman think it ought to apply to Armenia?

Mr. TEMPLE. I certainly do. The only country that is specifically excepted is Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes more.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I have only two minutes, and I want to say something in those two minutes. The bill provides for relief outside of Germany. It was the plan, as appears in the hearings, to establish a food-supply depot at Rotterdam and out of the supply at that depot to sell food to Germany, provided Germany brought the gold in hand to pay for it. I would not object to that. But the language of the bill seems to throw Germany out altogether.

So far as Mr. Hoover is concerned, I have this to say: The work he undertook and did is of a magnitude that is almost beyond comprehension. The first food administrator that we know anything about in history or tradition had seven fat years in which to get ready for the seven lean years. Mr. Hoover had none. If sometimes he overstepped the strict letter of the law, it was because of the magnitude of the need, and that man will live honorably in the records of these times when many of us are forgotten. [Applause.]

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TEMPLE. My time has expired, but I will yield for a question.

Mr. EMERSON. Does the gentleman say that the language in the first proviso makes it a revolving fund?

Mr. TEMPLE. Not the proviso, but the language preceding the proviso specifically says it shall be a revolving fund.

Mr. EMERSON. There is nothing mandatory about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] has remaining 55 minutes and the gentleman from Kentucky 20 minutes and a half, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] 17 minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE], that there is much to be said in favor of as well as against this bill. I think gentlemen of the committee are capable at this time to determine in their own minds as to what their line of duty should be in regard to this contemplated appropriation. There are certain propositions that every gentleman should consider when he comes to make up his mind to vote for this bill. In the first place, in a general way we know the origin of this bill. We know that the able and distinguished and disinterested gentleman who had charge of our own food control during the war, Mr. Hoover, some time ago went over to Europe; he went over there for the purpose of determining in his own mind what should be done to relieve the distressed conditions that exist throughout Europe among the peoples that were without food and needed supplies. We do not know what the result of his deliberations has been. We do not know what his conclusions are. We do not know to-day whether or not he has formulated any plan, but out of a clear sky comes practically the demand of the President, saying to us, "Give me \$100,000,000 to carry on the distribution of food in Europe."

What does that mean? I presume that it means that the \$100,000,000 is to be handed over to Mr. Hoover, but I do not know it.

Are gentlemen ready to vote \$100,000,000 without knowing to any extent in any manner by whom or to whom this fund is to be distributed? And yet that is what we are asked to do. We are asked to turn over this \$100,000,000 presumably to Mr. Hoover—to do what? To organize, I presume, some kind of food relief for Europe. And yet the President tells us that this \$100,000,000 is to be expended within the next six months. I presume it likely that this is to furnish the foundation upon which, until other nations can be brought into the arrangement, this distribution shall be made. We ought to know, if that be true, what these arrangements are.

I want to say to gentlemen in the House that the time has gone by when you can make these demands on the people of this country and have them approve of them without knowing what they are for. [Applause.] I want to say to the members of this committee that the people of this country will not sanction your action unless they know better than we do what it is for. I want to say to you that they will not sanction

your action on the supposition that it is going to be well used, and that it will meet their approval. I do not know whether it will or not. I sincerely hope that it will meet with their approval. But that is no reason why we should be called upon to grant this enormous fund in a lump-sum appropriation without knowing how and where it is to be used.

Gentlemen say, "Oh, the necessity is great. Bolshevism is sweeping over Europe." I wonder if in any gentleman's mind he thinks that what we give here will stop the spread of Bolshevism. What is Bolshevism? It is composed of two classes—the soldiers who have been discharged and the workmen who have no work. These have banded together upon a promise that they may divide the property of the earth among them and sustain themselves and govern themselves according to their own sweet will. Imagine those people being stopped by a loaf of bread! Gentlemen say that the Bolsheviki will be stopped only by "bread or bullets." Imagine that class of men being stopped by an offer of bread! They would spurn the offer and say, "We propose to take the bread, whether you give it or not." That is the spirit of Bolshevism.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I must not yield. I want to say, gentlemen, that you will not be justified before the people upon that assumption if you go to them with that reason for this appropriation. Neither will they hear you when you say you intended to stabilize the price of wheat. That is another afterthought intended for the purpose of forming some kind of an excuse to some gentlemen for voting for this bill. And yet at \$2 a bushel this \$100,000,000, if it were all spent for wheat, would buy only 50,000,000 bushels, and we are going to have a surplus for export and disposition of over 300,000,000 bushels. I wonder if that will stabilize the price of wheat.

No, gentlemen, these are not reasons; and I think if any gentleman goes before his people and says that at this time we took \$100,000,000 out of the Treasury without knowing where it was to go, or by whom it was to be expended, or whether or not we were the only persons to distribute the fund or others were to share with us, he will go before them without sufficient excuse for his action.

Ah, gentlemen, the time has come when it will not do to say we did this because of extraordinary emergency to carry on this war. The people of this country will expect you to look upon every proposition for every appropriation with the utmost care and scrutiny. It will not be sufficient for you to say to them, "It was a good cause, it was a good proposition, it was a good appropriation." You must say to them in order to justify an appropriation now, at least of this enormous amount, that it was indispensably necessary. Why, what is the financial condition of this country now, gentlemen? You can not possibly figure out how you are going to get enough money during the next year to pay the appropriations that will be absolutely necessary.

Take your \$6,000,000,000 that you are going to raise by taxation, and take your \$6,000,000,000 that you hope to raise by a bond issue, and you have \$5,000,000,000 or \$6,000,000,000 more yet to raise. Yef here you are spending \$100,000,000 prematurely, without knowing where it is to go, without knowing what it is to be spent for, just as if you had the Treasury overflowing with money. Gentlemen, you will have to answer before your constituents for conduct of this kind. In my judgment there ought to be presented to us an arrangement by which we could justify such an appropriation.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TOWNER. If you will make it brief.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would not the gentleman consider it sufficient justification if this is part of the program and part of the ideal we said we were fighting for?

Mr. TOWNER. My dear sir, if you say that we are to become the great fountain from which all this money is to be drawn for the rehabilitation of Europe, neither your people nor my people will approve of that idea. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the discussion and especially in the tone and temper and in the substance of the speeches of those who have opposed the bill. I regret to say it, but it does seem to me that a large part of the opposition grows consciously or unconsciously out of a desire to discredit the President of the United States while he sits in the councils of the nations abroad. [Applause.] I know that heretofore opposition to measures under consideration has been accompanied, not once but many times, with denunciation of other actions of the President; on every opportunity they have iterated and reiterated general and special

denunciation of him, and I know that excuses have been offered for opposition to this measure, by denunciation of Mr. Hoover, by denunciation of a certain corporation, and by all manner of excuses. It seems to me that the whole course of the Republicans is calculated and intended in this country and possibly abroad to cast a stain, a stigma, and a shame upon our representatives at the council table abroad. I want to tell you, gentlemen, that if you vote against this bill to-day you will live to see the day when your children will be ashamed of your vote. You may hope to shame the President but you will only shame your children by your speeches. [Applause.]

Before the last election these men who are denouncing the President now were the loudest in their declarations that they had loyally and devotedly supported the President in all his war policies, and that their party was even more loyal in their support of him than were the Democrats, and by their speeches and newspaper propaganda they convinced hundreds of thousands of voters, who honestly supported the President and believed in him as the wisest and strongest leader of the Nation, that these declarations were true. The voters did not analyze correctly the record of these Republicans. Had they done so, their votes would have been different. They would have discovered that even during the war they voted with the President on questions whenever overwhelming public sentiment drove them to support him, and that they obstructed and opposed every measure which it was safe to oppose or obstruct. They opposed and obstructed nearly all the measures to raise revenue; they opposed and obstructed the bill to create the Shipping Board and authorize the construction and operation of ships; the bill to create an armor-plate plant; a substantial majority of them favored the McLemore resolution and made a bitter fight to prevent its consideration by opposing the rule to consider it; and on these and many other measures they made hundreds of speeches bitterly criticizing the President. But when it came to appropriations for the Army and Navy they voted with the President. They would have been execrated if they had not, and they knew it, and on these latter votes they appealed to the country as supporters of the President. The President knew them and knew what kind of followers they were; but even he could hardly have dreamed that, after securing their election by professions of loyalty to him, they would turn around and declare that their election was a repudiation of him, as they began to do the day after the election and have continued to do ever since.

Before the election they were followers of the President, but under their cloaks of devoted followers they carried stiletos, ready to stab him in the back as soon as they could do it safely.

The President understood what kind of followers they were when he asked the American people to elect a Democratic majority; but they had so far convinced the people of their honesty and zeal in his support that many voters actually resented his request. The election is over; the Republicans are elected; their cloaks have fallen off and the stiletos they have always carried are no longer concealed. They stab the President openly and boastfully, and they hope and believe that by the next election they can so discredit and wound him that he will be shorn of his strength with the people. Every error, every mistake of omission or commission, every extravagance, every failure, either here or in France, is directly or indirectly laid at his individual door. We have heard it done in this debate to-day; we have heard it before and will hear it until November, 1920. And at every step the President takes he will be dogged and badgered by these men so loyal and devoted only a few months ago. The fight on this bill is only an illustration. It was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations; it was reported out against the almost solid opposition of the Republican membership of that committee. Speed in its passage was urgently needed, but the Republicans in the House objected to its consideration; a rule for its consideration had to be had; the Republicans on the Rules Committee opposed and at first, by absence of Democratic Members, defeated the rule in the committee. The full committee was gotten after several days' delay, and then the rule was reported out against the solid opposition of the Republicans and with the solid support of the Democrats, and so, Mr. Speaker, this measure, that tugs at the heartstrings of every man who has a soul, is made a party measure because the President asked for its passage. At first the Republican leaders, with a few conspicuous exceptions, seemed to fall over each other in order to get to oppose it, but as the debate proceeds they are weakening.

One gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] declared that while he was opposing the bill he would vote for it if an amendment making the Red Cross, an unofficial body, the agent to expend the money were adopted. Does his charity wait and hang on his spleen against the President? Or is it simply that he wants to make good the Republican statement that the last election

was a repudiation of the President? Or does he want to show Europe that he has no faith in our President, in whose hands the bill places the fund? Or, having opposed the bill, has he become ashamed, and is he seeking a loophole by which he may claim to support the purpose of the bill and yet assault the President? Or is he simply seeking to frame an excuse for his vote against the measure, which he will finally cast?

What is this proposition? It is a proposition on which our allies—England, France, and Italy—have already expressed their purpose, and they are even now extending their assistance to the starving nations of Europe; and our President, sitting in council with them, doubtless agreed with them and said what he thought the American Government would do. If he had listened to the quibbles of the gentlemen here, he would have stood with his finger in his mouth and said, "I do not know whether America will help or not," and you gentlemen would have been ashamed of your country and ashamed of your President if he had done so, and you know it. [Applause.]

A similar bill to this came before Congress when Mr. Roosevelt was President. A volcano or earthquake destroyed a part of Italy and your President asked for an appropriation of \$800,000 to relieve the stricken district. Every motive and purpose for the passage of this bill and every motive and purpose for opposition to it existed as to that bill when you gentlemen were in power and your President asked for help to relieve the suffering in Italy. You gave it to him without a whimper or a quibble, and you were right. The sum asked then was less than one-hundredth part of what is asked now, but the occasion was not one-hundredth part as great.

The man who stands here and opposes this measure necessarily hunts for an excuse. Every man who has expressed his opposition to this bill has hunted an excuse. He hides behind the Constitution, criticism of the President, criticism of Mr. Hoover, criticism of a certain corporation, behind anything he can conjure up, and he will be hunting for excuses as long as he stays in public life. [Applause.] Some gentlemen say, "We do not know; we have not been sufficiently informed as to the need of this." The gentlemen who last spoke and some others have said, "We object to bulk appropriations." What intelligent man is there who does not know the fearful and pressing need of the starving millions of Europe, and how in the name of God would you itemize an appropriation here to be given to the different nations—little Serbia, Albania, Roumania, Montenegro, parts of Italy, perhaps, or Poland? How are you going to itemize them?

Then some say, "We do not know who will expend this." Others say, "We do know who will expend it and we object because Mr. Hoover is going to have something to do with it." It is a congeries of excuses; but the real purpose seems to me to be to slap the President in the face while he sits at the council table. Well, gentlemen, that is one blow you will live to regret if you succeed in giving it. One gentleman, Mr. SLOAN, of Nebraska, declared, "It seems to me that we should begin to think of America and legislate for America. If there is any charitable credit to be drawn from the Treasury let us save it for Americans." If I had made that speech I would hide the Record containing it from my children.

The Good Book gives us a story told by the Master: "And Jesus answering [the lawyer] said: A certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among thieves, which stripped him of his raiment, and wounded him, and departed, leaving him half dead. And by chance there came down a certain priest that way, and when he saw him he passed by on the other side. And likewise a Levite, when he was at that place, came and looked on him, and passed by on the other side. But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was, and when he saw him he had compassion on him, and went to him, bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, and set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. And on the morrow when he departed he took out twopence and gave them to his host, and said unto him, 'Take care of him, and whatsoever thou spendest more, when I come again I will repay thee.' Which, now, of these three thinkest thou was neighbor unto him that fell among the thieves?"

Benedict Arnold has had ingenious apologists for his treason; Judas Iscariot has had excuses made for his betrayal; but in all the centuries that have passed no man has attempted to defend or excuse the priest and the Levite who passed by on the other side.

Among the great nations assembled at the peace-council table are England, France, and America. We were eleventh-hour servants in the vineyard, in the fighting of the war. Shall we take a small part or no part in the healing of the nations? We were ready to spend \$30,000,000,000 to fight our way to victory, but now some gentlemen are not willing to spend one three-

hundredth part of that amount to heal the wounds which were left in the wake of the war.

But, Mr. Chairman, the story of the priest and the Levite and the good Samaritan, or the appeal of stricken Italy in former times, is not all that is involved in this measure. If we and England and France and Italy were governed by the selfishness of some of the gentlemen who have spoken against this bill we might not save our treasure. Should all of us pass by on the other side and leave the starving, shivering millions of desolate Europe to die, they might in dying and in revolt against inhumanity inaugurate a reign of terror that would destroy all hope of peace and require a million or two million of the allied troops, our boys among the rest, to fight another war for the safety of civilization and to conquer peace again. The bloody French Revolution might pale before the monstrous upheaval of the beast that lurks in the hunger and despair of hundreds of millions of people. And we might spend not a hundred million dollars, but ten billions of dollars and thousands upon thousands of young men's lives, young men whose faces are now turning toward the west, whose eyes are gleaming with the hope of seeing soon their homes and loved ones. The great lesson of the war may yet be that love triumphs where armies fail; that the good Samaritan is at last the conqueror of the world; and this bill may be the beginning of the regeneration of civilization, the healing of the nations. It ought to pass without a dissenting vote. [Applause.]

ADDENDUM.

On the motion to recommit the bill and amend it so that the fund would be taken out of the President's hands and placed in the hands of the Red Cross there were—yeas, 1 Democrat and 118 Republicans; nays, 167 Democrats, 34 Republicans. On final passage of the bill there were—yeas, 154 Democrats, 87 Republicans; nays, 9 Democrats, 64 Republicans.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, there is no man in the American Congress, in either House I fancy, who takes a more kindly interest in the efforts of the President to bring about conditions in Europe that will not only make for peace, but for permanent peace, than I do. For years I have been an advocate in every substantial way of the program for a permanent peace which is now proposed by the President. Of course, I wish him God-speed in his efforts to build up an organization throughout the world that will help to lift the burdens from off the shoulders of the people, by lessening armament everywhere, and for securing permanent peace. I welcome the overthrow of the autocracies in Russia and Germany as a step toward that permanent peace, because I believe the people will never assess against themselves, if they have control, the penalty of suicide.

But, Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the greatest menace now threatening civilization in the whole wide world is anarchy, sometimes called Bolshevism. Bolshevism and anarchy exist in Russia through an enormous area. It is rapidly spreading over the whole German Empire. If we are going to appease hunger that makes people restless and inclines them to anarchy, why should we overlook what is perhaps the greatest point of danger in all Europe to-day? Surely, hunger affects the German people, as it affects those in Russia and Serbia, Asia Minor, and other parts of the world. There is no exclusion of Turkey in this bill as far as I can see, the people of the Ottoman Empire, and if we are to exclude the German people, the most of whom had nothing to do with making the war, and who are among its greatest victims, except the devastated areas in France and Belgium—if we are to exclude them, do we tend to allay their unrest, do we tend to reconcile them to the control of the leading associated governments? Do we tend to help bring them into the league of peace, as ultimately they must come, if that league is worth having, by saying that we will prevent anarchy in Russia, we will cure anarchy in all other parts of the world, but we will let you starve and thereby promote anarchy in your section of the country?

To my mind that is the only good reason for the passage of the bill, but I think I see some reasons why it should not pass. Being old-fashioned, I am accustomed to act in accordance with a document that I swore to uphold and defend. I can find no authority in the Constitution for the contribution of \$100,000,000 for charity anywhere. The President says in his cable:

I wish to appeal to the great sense of charity and good will of the American people toward the suffering, and to place that act primarily on a humanitarian basis.

Now, if the President had said that in his scheme to bring peace to the whole world it appeared essential, in his judgment as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, to facilitate the progress of universal peace, that we should do this thing, that we should help the governments and the peoples who are not in a position to help themselves, it would have been, in my opinion, a stronger appeal and with greater justification for the votes we are asked to give. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Does the gentleman remember in the Fifty-ninth Congress, when President Roosevelt requested an appropriation for Italy?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I was not in Washington at that time.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to discuss this question or impose myself on the House. But we have been so frequently lectured by certain gentlemen self-imposed censors in this House that while intending to vote against this measure, I now desire to make a few observations.

I assume that every man on this floor who proposes to vote for this measure is absolutely honest. I assume that he is absolutely patriotic. I challenge his right, however, to even suggest that anyone who opposes it has less than he of either one of these qualities. I specially resent the lecture which we received from the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] about the lack of patriotism of those who oppose this bill. When men on this floor have made sacrifices that he did not and could not make, he has no right, living in the time that he is and of the age that he is, to stand here and criticize any man as to any vote on any war procedure.

No man, unless he has taken the risk to sacrifice himself in this war, having an opportunity to do so, or through those of his own blood, has the right to question the patriotism of any man who stands here and votes as he believes patriotic and right. [Applause.]

The day has been when a man could stand here and say if you do not vote thus and so the public will deem you disloyal, and you know that the loudest mouthed of all those men have been the men who made the least sacrifices during the war. [Applause.] A specious plea has been made here to-day. It has been made too often in the last 21 months—that you must stand by your Government, and then explain that the Government means the President of the United States. That would be true in Russia, and it may be true in the minds of some men living in this country with their hearts over yonder, but it is not true generally in America, and I hope it never will be. The President of the United States is not the Government, and the Capital of the United States is still in Washington and not yet in Versailles or Paris.

Many of us are becoming weary of discussions concerning the league of nations. There are many nations, and if some would influence or control others, there must be some kind of combination of nations. But up to this time, as each eye sees a different rainbow so all men have their different visions of a league of nations for peace. Whatever the official conception of the league may be, there is only one who knows, and he refuses to tell, except, perhaps, into the ear of royalty.

It seems to me that we should begin to think of America and legislate for America. If there is any charitable credit to be drawn from our Treasury let us save it for Americans. Extend this charity from the Treasury in favor of those to whom we owe no obligation, and what answer will you make to the pleas which common foresight must see rising from every quarter of the United States?

Has the atmosphere of France prompted those who should be most solicitous for our Treasury's stability to subscribe to the easy philosophy spoken over there a century and a half ago by Mme. Pompadour when she comforted that fatuous French monarch with the statement, "After us, the deluge"?

It would seem that if our quondam President had not been so obsessed with the delusion of his own indispensability and burdened with the authorship and advocacy of the 14 points of ambiguity, now largely scrapped, and had appointed three great Democrats and two great Republicans to have met the leading statesmen of Europe at the peace table there would have been no S O S sent hither for a golden crutch to support a prestige which his friends deem in danger.

The reasons urged for this bill are, first, that we are practically pledged to it by one Hoover, toward whom it is said that no finger has been pointed. I point no finger at him, but as long as they have specially mentioned Hoover, permit me to say that a great many of the producers of this country will remember him for many years to come as one who thought of

the American producer last, if at all. He thought of the foreign consumer and made the standard of cattle the Argentine product instead of the product of our own country. Out of this grew the bankruptcy of a large number of people throughout the Northwest. Mr. Hoover has no authority from the Congress of the United States to make a pledge of a single dollar to be paid under any circumstances out of the Treasury of the United States. "Upon what meat doth this, our Hoover, feed, that he has grown so great" that he can without authority of Congress pledge the credit of the United States? What right has our chief commissioner over there to pledge the credit of the United States? Men differ with regard to this, but I regard him only as chief peace commissioner over there, and nothing more. I do not regard him as the President of the United States at this time. He is there as a commissioner, or in no capacity whatever. A peace commissioner has no authority over us, the custodians of the coin, the currency, and the credit of the United States, or jurisdiction to pledge \$100,000,000 for any charity.

A picturesque character in another forum said that our Chief Commissioner was over there as Commander in Chief of our armies. "Angels and ministers of grace defend us" all from such a defense. He would have the Commander in Chief remain 4,000 miles away, with stormy seas between, while the "battle of the ages" raged along the deadliest line of the centuries until the fighting ceased and then with hysteric haste hurry to the zone of former conflict. As no one on that side has seen fit to defend against that defense, permit me in this way to break a lance in his behalf.

It is said that it would embarrass our quondam President, now acting as chief peace commissioner over yonder should we not give him this \$100,000,000. Was it not thought of by him that it might be embarrassing for some of his friends to vote their convictions and against this raid on the National Treasury? If he would reach for this money in the Treasury of the United States, why did he not consult with the Congress before this round-robin message was sent? It did not come from the President of the United States constitutionally. It could not come from the President of the United States while he is over there. If it had come from the President of the United States, it would have come in person or through a message to the Congress of the United States and not to the Secretary of the Treasury, unless he saw fit to show fine scorn for this body.

Is \$100,000,000 a bauble—such a paltry sum that it is not worth mentioning to the Congress of the United States, the lawful guardians of the Treasury? One hundred million dollars is almost the precise sum the collection or noncollection of which at the ports of the United States turned the control of the country from the Republican side of the House to the Democrats. I fear this absent treatment being administered to the Republic is going to be very expensive. Now, how lightly they say he asks for this \$100,000,000 in order to keep his prestige at high-water mark! What prestige can a commissioner for peace have or lose that he could purchase back by \$100,000,000? Philip of Macedon said that the golden key could open the gate of any city, but I do not understand that we are sufficiently interested in the portals of Europe to use the golden key on any of their cities, or any of their countries. Here Congress is expected to yield, as it has too often in the last six years under implied threat that in case Congress stood by its convictions some dire calamity would occur. We remember well a national campaign was conducted on a certain issue, and when it was won we were asked to grant an ungrudging reversal of that issue on account of matters of nearer and greater consequence. Years have elapsed, but what these consequences were no man knows any more than he does the unrevealed secrets of Sahara's silent Sphinx.

We are asked for \$100,000,000, and men who oppose it want to know when it is to be given, to whom it is to be given, how it is to be safeguarded, to whom it is to be paid, and no answer is given. They practically say you heard our demand, yield. Your oaths and your country's good are both entirely irrelevant.

We should not grant the \$100,000,000 to dazzle the real powers of Europe, which are Britain, France, and Italy. There has been enough of splendor since that composite company seized the American transport named for the father of our country and after converting it into a floating palace of glass, walled within with costly wood and precious metal, furnished it with all the trappings to delight the vision and invite super-comfort of those on board. There was a commissary that would tickle palate, appease appetite, and assuage thirst. It sailed away with many men of many minds, including statesmen, diplomats, scribes, healers, chefs, necromancers, valets, vocalists, and those who performed cunningly on flute and harp.

The burdened cables and the surcharged upper ether brought multiplied messages of the glory and splendor of their Britannia landing. The princely, yea, imperial, meeting at gay Paris or historic Versailles sent every volatile Frenchman in thought back 400 years ago to the regal meeting of the English and French sovereigns on the "Field of the Cloth of Gold." It has been a source of gratification to some inhabitants of the United States that the splendor and glory of the "Field of the Cloth of Gold" had dimmed before the blaze of the twentieth century's resplendent magnificence. There are those, too, who see in this proceeding how the mysterious Mr. House had in making arrangements far outclassed Cardinal Wolsey, who had brought together the vain King Francis I and the autocratic Henry VIII. History says of that famous meeting, "It attracted much attention, but little was achieved." History has a way of repeating itself.

Why longer delay for further display? Have they not dined at Buckingham Palace where unaccustomed guests wear smoked glasses that the splendor injure not their vision?

Have they not reposed in the palace of the Quirinal over against the Capitoline, where once slumbered the rulers of Imperial Rome? Have they not visited the Vatican? Yea, more, do they not lodge in the palace of Murat, the lord of which traces his lineage to the family of the great Corsican?

It might, but it should not, be a fitting finish to distribute imperial largesses from our National Treasury unto the professional poor of Europe. We have been generous even unto profligacy in our loans. We have given from the pockets of our people vast sums through the Red Cross, Young Men's Christian Association, Knights of Columbus, and similar organizations to alleviate the want and suffering of Europe. That is proper. But the Treasury of the United States is not an eleemosynary institution. It should not be used as such. We read in the dispatches about many small nations being formed in Europe whether the large nations of that continent favor them or not. I am opposed to calling into existence further small nations if American blood must defend them or the American Treasury sustain them.

Bolshevism is rampant in Europe. Already the allies are disclaiming responsibility for the overthrow of the government upon which it has raised its crimson flag. They impliedly call attention to America's responsibility. We should not feed Bolshevism in Europe. We may need our food and energy to resist and maybe fight it in America.

Note the following recent dispatch:

OUR JOB TO CRUSH REDS, PAPER SAYS.

LONDON, January 12.

In an editorial to-day, advocating suppression of the Bolsheviki, the Globe declared it is "Uncle Sam's job."

"We appeal to President Wilson and America to consider the Russian situation and ask themselves whether they haven't serious responsibilities in that regard," said the Globe.

"President Wilson knows it is useless for his high ideals to be realized while Russia is a welter of madness and bloodshed. Doesn't President Wilson think that suppression of the Bolsheviki is Uncle Sam's job? Somebody must do it. We and the French are in no condition for such an undertaking."

This money is not needed in peace negotiations. Six weeks have elapsed since the *George Washington* lifted anchor, and the diplomatic gladiators are still sparring for an opening. If it be not lese majesty or contempt of court, let me suggest as a means of settlement that they "proceed to settle." Paraphrasing Horace Greeley's famous statement, "The way to settle is to settle."

This debate is nearly closed and we are still about as short of information as Mark Twain was in his day. Mark Twain had a son christened William, but called Willy. He, too, was over in Europe. He, too, was in the atmosphere of nobility. He, too, basked in the blaze of near royalty. On the morning after he, too, looked about and saw that there were poor in Europe, and so he cabled for a thousand dollars. Mark Twain, like some of us, wanted to know and cabled back "What for," and he answered that it was "for Willy." Now, this is "for Woodrow," with about as much information as Willy had vouchsafed Mark. I am opposed to giving \$100,000,000 to keep Woodrow in the king row.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to have about two minutes more.

Mr. GILLETT. I am very sorry, but all my time has been promised.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to finish that cablegram. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT. I have promised every minute that I have got.

By unanimous consent Mr. SLOAN was granted leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

By unanimous consent, leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD was granted to Mr. GORDON, Mr. GILLETT, and Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, the cablegram of the President contains a most extraordinary request. We are informed that the appropriation asked for is necessary to prevent people living in areas devastated by war from starving to death. If we read between the lines we can reasonably conclude that, in the opinion of the President, food and supplies in the areas referred to will bring order out of chaos and result in the creation of some sort of government in the place of anarchy. Viewed in this aspect, the bill can well be regarded as a war measure.

We must bear in mind that the war is not yet ended. If humanitarian acts will tend to prevent further devastation of war and hasten the time when our soldiers can safely be ordered from overseas to America, then our duty in the premises is clear. [Applause.]

It is apparent that whatever is to be done must be promptly done. We can not dally in the face of starvation and anarchy. The President is on the ground; he is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States; he has urged upon us the necessity of prompt action, and in the absence of information which he must be presumed to possess I can not bring myself, through partisan or other motives, to the point of denying his request. [Applause.]

The expenditure of \$100,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, now might result in the saving not only of billions of dollars, but also of many precious American lives. The President has not seen fit to consult with us before making his request, but the request is before the world, and it seems to me that in time of war we are bound to sustain the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAGEE. I regret I have not any time to yield.

It is immaterial whether we deemed it wise or unwise for the President to go overseas; it is unavailing whether we agree or disagree with his views in the making of the treaty of peace; and it is irrelevant to our determination as legislators whom he shall designate to carry out his orders in the distribution and application of the funds provided.

Mr. MADDEN. Did the gentleman say he would yield?

Mr. MAGEE. I must respectfully decline to yield; I have not the time.

The fact remains that he has gone overseas, and we should wish him success and a Godspeed in his great mission. The fact exists that he has strong convictions upon the kind of a treaty of peace that will best guarantee the future peace of the world, and it is apparent that the responsibility for the distribution of any appropriation made by the Congress must rest upon him. [Applause.]

One other thing is apparent and absolutely controlling: We must not discredit the President of the United States before the world on the eve of the peace conference, which will be the most momentous gathering in all history [applause], and probably shape the destinies of the peoples upon this earth for generations to come. [Applause.]

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON].

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the argument of my friend from New York who has just spoken is, to say the least, very discouraging, because if what he says is true we need not expect these large, unprecedented appropriations to cease until domestic peace has been restored in all the countries of the world. Now, I say that is very discouraging. This bill affords a splendid illustration of the different way that arguments appeal to the minds of different Members. Now, one argument advanced in favor of this bill here to-day is that there is a large amount of food, particularly meats, that have been accumulated at high prices by the packers and by others in this country and that this appropriation will afford a ready market for that accumulated food. Now, gentlemen of the House, that is one of the reasons why I am against the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. No; I have not the time; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. DENISON. I will never vote for an appropriation from the Public Treasury in order to supply an easy market for the foodstuffs that may have accumulated at war prices in the hands of the packers or anyone else in this country.

Another argument that has been advanced by advocates of this measure, particularly the chairman of the committee, is that this money will be expended largely in this country. Now, that is another reason why I am opposed to the bill; that is, I am not willing to vote appropriations out of the Treasury to be given away to the people of other countries, simply because the money will be spent for the foodstuffs that are produced in this country.

Another argument advanced in favor of the bill is that it will tend to stop Bolshevism. Now, gentlemen of the House, I do not know any place where Bolshevism is doing so much damage as it is doing in Germany to-day, and yet we are not going to spend any of this money, they say, in Germany. The chairman of the committee [Mr. SHERLEY], I believe, said that none of this money is to be given away in Germany, because Germany has plenty of money to feed her own people; and yet if that argument in favor of this bill is sound, there ought not to be any Bolshevism in Germany, because he says they have plenty of money in Germany to feed their people. That argument that this appropriation will help stop the spread of Bolshevism does not appeal to me at all. But the main argument, as I understand it, that has been advanced in favor of this bill is the one stated by the President in his cablegram—that we ought to make this appropriation for charitable and humanitarian reasons. Now, gentlemen of the House, that is another reason why I am against the bill. I do not think it is my duty, nor do I have the right, as a Member of the House, to vote appropriations out of the Public Treasury for charitable or humanitarian disbursement in foreign countries. I think that appeals for funds for humanitarian purposes should be addressed to the people of the country and not to their Representatives in Congress. During some of the recent Red Cross campaigns I had occasion to speak and appeal to the people of my district to contribute to the Red Cross and to the Y. M. C. A. and other war-work agencies. We wanted those funds to help take care of our suffering and dying soldiers who were fighting our battles for us. I was asked by a number of people why Congress did not appropriate money for the Red Cross and for the Y. M. C. A. Surely those were commendable causes and it seems to me, at least, it is just as commendable and as urgent that we give our money to administer to our own suffering and dying soldiers as it is for us to give money to feed the people of foreign lands. I had to answer that it was not the policy of the Government or the part of wisdom to appropriate money out of the Public Treasury for such purposes. Those are purposes of mercy and of charity, and we must depend upon those impulses in the people themselves to give, as far as they are able to give, for that kind of relief. If the President had appealed to the people to contribute this money to help feed the starving peoples of Europe, I would have been glad to have helped to raise it in every way I could; but I am opposed to making an appropriation out of the Public Treasury for that purpose. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when I am unwilling to vote large lump-sum appropriations upon the mere request of the President or any other person. While we were at war, and it was necessary to devote all our resources to the prosecution of the war, I was willing to give the President such powers as he thought were necessary to enable him to successfully prosecute the war. But now we are no longer threatened by a common enemy, and the chief purpose of our entering into the war has been accomplished, and before I vote for any more hundred million dollar appropriations from the Public Treasury I have got to know that it is for a purpose for which we have a legitimate right under the Constitution to tax the people; and I have got to be shown who is going to expend the money and how it is going to be expended. After the German Army had ruthlessly marched over Belgium and France, destroying the homes of the people, devastating the country, and leaving the people dying from exposure and starvation, did the President call upon Congress for an appropriation from the Public Treasury to help relieve those people? No. He called upon the people for voluntary contributions for that purpose, and the money was freely given. When Austrian and Bulgarian Armies marched over Serbia, driving the Serbian Army out of their own country and completely devastating Serbia and leaving the people of that country starving and dying, did the President ask Congress to appropriate money from the Public Treasury in order to relieve them? No. But now, when the fighting is over and the President goes to Europe for the purpose

of impressing upon the representatives of the countries over there the necessity of incorporating into the treaty of peace certain ideas of his own as to a league of nations and other plans which he thinks will insure an eternal peace on earth among men, he cables back that he wants \$100,000,000 out of the Public Treasury to help feed the people of those countries. I do not think we have enough information upon which to make an appropriation of this kind. I think the President should have taken Congress more into his confidence and disclosed to us more of his plans and purposes. If the people of Europe are starving, I think the people of this country should contribute freely for their relief, but I think such contribution should be entirely voluntary. I do not think that we should tax the people of this country for all these many millions in order to distribute charity to the peoples of Europe. If the President had been willing to send a message back to the American people telling them of the conditions in Europe, and had asked the people to contribute at once for the relief of the suffering over there, I am sure many Members of the House would have been willing, as I would have been, to turn to our districts and appeal to the people to contribute of their means for that purpose; but I do not think that we, as representatives of the people, without any authority from those we represent, have any right to levy taxes upon the people to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars to be given away by the President in Europe, however charitable and merciful his purposes may be.

We have been appropriating money in staggering amounts for the prosecution of this war, and we have of necessity got to continue doing so in order to meet the legitimate obligations that will fall upon the Government as a result of the war. The time is coming when the people are going to demand an accounting and we will have to explain by what right we made these vast appropriations of the people's money. It will only be a short time until there will be another Government-bond campaign, and all over this country the people will be begged to loan the Government money. More funds will have to be raised for the Red Cross, and we will have to appeal to the people for voluntary contributions for various purposes growing out of this war. I think we should hesitate before we appropriate money out of the Treasury in order to stop the spread of Bolshevism in Europe. We have no assurance and no facts upon which to even base an opinion that the expenditure of \$100,000,000 to help feed the peoples of Europe will have any effect whatever upon the spread of Bolshevism.

I am unwilling to vote for this appropriation, because I think it establishes a dangerous precedent. It will only be a short time, I fear, until other appeals will be made for similar appropriations, because if the President is going to undertake to help feed the world in order to prevent revolution, civil war, or other disorders in foreign lands, we will have to be making appropriations a long time, and it will only be a short time until these appropriations will amount to many hundreds of millions. And where will we stop? The time to stop such appropriations is before we begin them. I think that we should confine our appropriations of the public funds to those purposes which are the legitimate and necessary functions of the Government, and that the money we spend to feed the starving peoples of Europe or for other charitable or humanitarian purposes should be raised by voluntary subscriptions of the people.

For months I have appealed, as I am sure many Members have, to the War Department and the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to pay to the families of our soldiers the allotments and allowances that are due them. And yet these payments have not been made and the families of those who are fighting for this country have been positively suffering in many instances because this Government has not met its obligations to its own people. Even our soldiers themselves have not been paid. I wish that more attention could be paid to the obligations that the country owes its own soldiers and the families of the soldiers and to those who are suffering for want of food here before we begin distributing money from the Public Treasury to the peoples of Europe. We can not afford, of course, to see people die of starvation anywhere if we can prevent it. But in the absence of more information than we now have, I am unwilling to appropriate public money for that purpose now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman from Illinois use some of his time?

Mr. CANNON. I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] seven minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Gentlemen, the voting of this authorization is to enable the administration to treat all peoples who have engaged in the great European war on a parity with one another, except the people of Germany. For my part, I would like to see that exception eliminated, because it has been stated

time and time again from the very beginning of the war that we were not warring against the peoples of Germany but against the governing class. The hearings disclose the intention not to except Germany, but to allow foodstuffs to be sold to Germany for cash.

Under existing law, in the act passed within less than a month after we declared war, authority was vested in the administration to advance to the credit of foreign governments engaged in the war against the central powers the moneys of this Government to the extent of billions of dollars. At the present time the Treasury is advancing moneys to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars to all those governments—to Great Britain, to France, to Italy, to Belgium, to Serbia, to Greece, and to the Czecho-Slovak nation—for the rehabilitation of those countries and for the purchase of foodstuffs and supplies. And yet it can not, because of the phraseology of the law, advance credit and funds to the Jugo-Slavs or the Polish people. Having invited those people to assist us in the war in overthrowing Germany to the extent of sacrificing their lifeblood, are we to refuse them, just because they have no form of government now in existence, the succor we are extending to other peoples? Is it to be said that we are going to have one policy toward one people and a different policy as to another people?

Mr. SLOAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Just for a short question.

Mr. SLOAN. Does not the gentleman know that we are loaning money to the Czecho-Slovak government now?

Mr. STAFFORD. I stated that, because that is one of the recognized governments; but we are not loaning money to the Jugo-Slavs, nor are we able under that law to advance money to the Poles. Those people were just as instrumental in overthrowing the autocratic Government of Germany as the established governments and allied powers were.

Gentlemen in opposing this proposition would restrict, would hamper, the President in his efforts to settle this great world problem. Why, I have seen the Congress vote millions of dollars without authority, as, for instance, for the relief of the people of Salem, Mass., for a little conflagration, and the entire Massachusetts delegation voted solidly for that unconstitutional appropriation. [Applause.] And in times of peace we have voted hundreds of thousands of dollars when some earthquake devastated certain portions of the outside world without constitutional authority. But here, with war still existing technically, when we have the full right and authority to aid the President, and to allow him to expend this money, objection is raised. Who knows but what at the peace table the President and the allied powers might not exact from our enemy, Germany, the return of this \$100,000,000, or so much money as may be advanced to these unconstituted authorities as is necessary for the rehabilitation of those countries, and, what is more necessary, to prevent starvation from stalking everywhere in those countries.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. GORDON. If it is unconstitutional to give money to your own citizens, why is it not unconstitutional to give it to non-resident aliens?

Mr. STAFFORD. Because we are still at war. Only an armistice has been declared, and it is in the power of the President, as one of the terms of peace to exact from Germany, our enemy, the return of the money that this Government and the allied governments will advance to these people.

Criticism has been lodged against this measure in that it should not be done by the Government, but by the Red Cross. We recognized the policy of advancing this money through the Government in the very first bond act, in making loans and advancing money to the powers that exist. Shall it be said that just because the governments do not exist, whereby we can deal directly with them as a constituted entity, that we should be deprived of making these advances?

In the bill that is about to be presented for consideration following this measure, the legislative appropriation bill, hundreds of thousands of dollars are to be voted to the Department of Commerce to advance our commerce in the way of rehabilitating these stricken countries that have been engaged in this war. There can be no better business proposition, looking at it from the standpoint of American business policy, than for us to vote this \$100,000,000 to alleviate the suffering conditions in those countries. Shall it be said that we were strong for making profits from the sale of munitions, but unwilling to lend a helping hand to aid the distressed in the impoverished countries devastated by the war?

I remember attending a lecture given by Mr. Rockwell, a representative of the Rockefeller Foundation, after the de-

vastating drive Germany made across Poland, in which he depicted the terrible conditions existing all through Poland, and request was made that Congress should aid—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask the gentleman from Illinois to give me all the time he can spare.

Mr. CANNON. I have three minutes remaining, which I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. And request was made that Congress should aid in relieving and alleviating those conditions by appropriating \$500,000,000, and a like amount to be raised by private subscription. We did not feel it incumbent upon us at that time, because we were not in the war, but there are some men here who were strongly in favor of getting into the war but who do not wish now to recognize the obligations that come as the result of the war. You can not shirk these responsibilities even if you would.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. There is a disposition among some Members of this Chamber and there is a disposition throughout the country that, now that the armistice has been signed, we should separate ourselves absolutely from the conditions growing out of the war. I, too, wish to extricate our Government from European imbrolios, but there are certain obligations thrust upon us that follow as a corollary to our entrance in the war. One of the obligations imposed on the United States as a result of the war is to take care of the people who aided in the victory that came so suddenly, to prevent them from starving until they can return to peaceful pursuits.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. In a moment. Shall we say to the Jugo-Slavic people and to the Poles, who were patriotic to the core in helping to overthrow Germany, that just because there is no government in existence of the Jugo-Slavs or in Poland whereby we could advance money to them on bonds and give them credit, we shall allow starvation to spread, and permit utter ruin, chaos, and anarchy to follow? I believe the American people, after we have withdrawn billions of expenditures from foreign Governments for furnishing bullets and munitions against warring people, will at least be willing to give \$100,000,000 of our ample stores to try to rehabilitate those people by giving them bread instead of bullets.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I wanted to ask if the gentleman had voted for the declaration of war?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, everybody in this Chamber knows that I did not. That is merely a flippant interjection on the part of the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Oh, no; the gentleman—

Mr. STAFFORD. I decline to yield for such flippant remarks. That is beside the question under discussion. Every vote of mine since the declaration of war has been to the end of carrying that war to a successful conclusion. Now that the armistice has been signed, I am not willing to hamper the President, under the guise of economy, to bring about conditions in stricken Europe, so that he can not negotiate the proper terms for an enduring peace. I am that kind of a patriot, and not a partisan war advocate. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois yields five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio from the allotment of the gentleman from Massachusetts. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, if I am given an opportunity I will offer an amendment to this bill which, I believe, will provide a safeguard in the distribution of this fund which will be fair and which is as little as we, the representatives of the people, should do.

The bringing of this bill before the House presents a most serious problem to every conscientious Member. I do not believe that the time has come when this country can refuse to respond to the pleas of outcrying and suffering humanity, no matter where they may be. I do not believe that the time has come—and I trust that it may never come—when the conditions of our Treasury will be such as to make it impossible for us to aid the suffering because we can not afford to be charitable. This is a great, resourceful, and powerful Nation, and we can afford to do our part, be it great or small, toward every humanitarian project.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Following that out, I think it will follow as a consequence that, having made this appropriation, some future Congress will be called upon to appropriate great funds to stop the formation of bread lines in the United States.

Mr. McCULLOCH. That may be necessary some day, yet I hope not. But the time has come when it is the duty of this House to scrutinize not only all bills appropriating money but all pleas for money of every kind that may be made. There is a limit to which the people will justify extravagant expenditures. Under the Constitution the power is lodged with Congress to raise money by placing upon the people the burdens of taxation. Under the provisions of that same Constitution Congress has the power to disburse by appropriations the money so raised among the various departments for governmental purposes or otherwise. The granting and the accepting of such powers carry corresponding responsibilities. Under the stress of war the Members of this House have let down the bars and have granted lump-sum appropriations and a lavish expenditure of money unequalled in the history of the Republic. Such action was justified because we were at war; but the emergency has now passed, and the bars should be put up again, and Congress should assume the responsibility of placing a check upon the lavish expenditure of the public moneys. Lump-sum appropriations should be discouraged. Europe thinks we are rolling in wealth, and naturally they want us to finance the world. But every dollar you appropriate must come out of the pockets of the American people, and there may be a limit to their endurance.

The longer I listened to the arguments that have been made to-day, confused as they were, about our purposes and our desires and the necessities on the other side of the ocean, the more respect I had for the admonitions of George Washington in his Farewell Address, when he warned us to beware of foreign entanglements. [Applause.]

I do not believe we should be appropriating money to pay tribute for justice. If we, upon our merits, can not get justice at the peace table, we can not get it by attempting to buy it. If I vote for this bill, I shall do so agreeing with the President of the United States that it is strictly a charitable proposition, and I do not want my country to be in the attitude of being charged with buying justice with American dollars, as some Members would make appear necessary.

I will not oppose this bill if it is amended so as to put a check on the distribution of the money, but I am opposed to making a lump-sum appropriation of a hundred million dollars for Herbert Hoover to distribute throughout the world as he sees fit.

I am opposed to trying to buy our way into Europe, either for the purposes of trade or otherwise, with American dollars. I am opposed to the idea that we must give billions as tribute in order to get justice at the peace table.

Those who are shortsighted enough to advocate such a course are not following the President's request, but are simply playing into the hands of Europe, and their leadership should be repudiated by the Members of this House, for such leadership will, just as sure as the days come and go, be repudiated by the people of this Nation. The spirit of the fathers of this country is not dead. The great mass of the American people still believe that we should look after America first and the rest of the world afterwards. They are still opposed to getting down on their knees to kings and princes, and they believe that we should play a man's part in the world's affairs and not the part of a cringing weakling trying to buy our way to favor. We have millions of men and millions of money for equity and justice and millions for deserving charity and for aiding humanity, but not one cent for tribute. If we place about the appropriation proper safeguards, we will be doing our fully duty at least in that regard. [Applause.]

The Washington Evening Star of January 11, last Saturday, printed the following in regard to this bill:

Administration officials are deeply concerned about the delay of Congress in appropriating the fund. Friends of President Wilson believe opposition to this appropriation may affect seriously the prestige of the representatives of the United States at the peace table.

Under the terms of the allied agreement, by which Herbert C. Hoover was put in charge of the rationing of the world's food supply, it is believed here that, acting under authority of President Wilson, Mr. Hoover promised that the United States would take the part in the proposed plan indicated by the President's request for the \$100,000,000 appropriation. Exact details of the arrangement under which Mr. Hoover acts have not been received here.

Should Congress repudiate the President's request, following its failure to accept Secretary McAdoo's suggestion that a \$500,000,000 revolving fund be established, from which to make loans to the allies, it is contended that the President will be placed in an anomalous position.

The reason given by administration officials for not specifying more definitely to whom the food supplies are to go is that Mr. Hoover should be left free to meet changing conditions as the needs arise.

It is held by supporters of the administration that the United States already has suffered, both in friendly feeling and in commercial prospects, by the declination of Congress to authorize peace-time loans to allied nations. Other powers will be found to make the loans, and trade naturally will follow in the wake of these loans, it is argued. Japan is ready to make loans, it is understood here, and thus she will be able to extend her influence in a trade field where, it is held, the United States should seize every opportunity of gaining a firm foothold.

The statements set out in that article have been confirmed by majority leaders upon the floor of this House this morning. It has been contended that in order that we may have influence at the peace table we must make this hundred-million-dollar appropriation. It has been contended that in order that the President and our representatives may have prestige in Europe and be enabled to secure certain concessions and the justice for which they are contending that we must pay tribute by way of appropriating millions of dollars to be expended in Europe. I do not believe that any thoughtful man would want to go on record as sustaining such a course or advocating such a policy. Either we are giving this money to aid the starving or we should not give it at all, and we should have no other purpose in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] desire further recognition?

Mr. GILLETT. How does the time stand?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Kentucky 15½ minutes.

Mr. GILLETT. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have insisted from the beginning that Congress should have information that would justify it in making this appropriation. I still insist that that is not only the right but the duty of Congress. No information has been given here to-day by anybody advocating this appropriation that justifies the Congress in taking this amount of money from the Treasury. The country has just gotten through with giving \$225,000,000 to the Red Cross and six other allied organizations. This money is in the hands of those organizations to-day for charitable purposes. It is in the hands of persons who are in Europe and on the way over there. Within five minutes I have spoken to an agent of the American Red Cross who leaves to-morrow for Europe for the purpose of doing the very work that it is proposed to do by this appropriation, and the American Red Cross is an organization that extends into every section of Europe. They know every part of that country where there is hunger and want. Not a member of that organization appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, or the Committee on Rules in support of this appropriation. They did not ask for a dollar. They are in possession of information that could be given to the Congress and to the country in justification of this appropriation if there is such evidence. The only information here comes from an alleged survey made by Mr. Hoover of the conditions in Europe. He went upon his own motion or by appointment from the President to seek justification for a continuation of his activities as a dispenser of charity and a controller of food products. On the 9th day of January, 1919, the day the Committee on Rules had this matter up, an Associated Press dispatch from Paris covering the question of food distribution to the people of the central powers and the Balkans commented on the lifting of the embargo and the effect that that would have, and stated that that was one of the things that would be considered by the peace conference. But up to this time, the dispatch stated, all that had been done had been done by Mr. Hoover; that up to that time England and Italy had not yet appointed food commissioners to consider the subject. It is plain to me that Mr. Hoover's activities in Paris and in London had not impressed England and Italy up to that time with the importance of appointing food commissioners and of engaging in the activities that he was urging this country to engage in.

There is too much of a disposition on the part of Congress to appropriate lavishly out of the Treasury upon these requests without justification or proper information. The allied representatives—and I speak of them separate from the United States—are approaching the peace table with their minds on indemnity, on the restoration of the statu quo ante bellum. They are approaching the peace table with a determination to secure

from the vanquished foe indemnity for every wrong done and for every dollar spent during the war. I have not heard of a word from our peace commissioners as to a request for indemnity or for money spent during the war. On the other hand, it was naively stated from Paris yesterday that it will be suggested to the American peace commissioners that it would be a most magnanimous action on their part to relinquish all claims for the return of the moneys we have advanced to the allied powers—relinquish claims for the return of moneys advanced to England, France, and Italy. The allies have no hesitation in looking at the proposition from the cold-blooded financial viewpoint.

Sob stuff has been given us here to-day for the purpose of getting \$100,000,000 out of the Treasury. Mr. Chairman, it will take hard work to produce \$100,000,000 by the American people to pay this sum. I am thinking of those who will have it to pay. Our first duty is to the people of the United States. We have prepared to do charity by giving \$225,000,000 to organizations that are prepared actively to engage in charitable work in the war zone of Europe. That has all been done by voluntary contributions by the American people. I repeat that no justification has been given here to warrant Congress in taking \$100,000,000 out of the Treasury to do a charitable work that already has been provided for through the American Red Cross and other organizations, seven in number, with representatives extending throughout the countries affected by the war.

We must get below the clouds and take a practical view of the things plainly in sight. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGUARDIA].

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I will attempt to give some of the information asked for by the various speakers this afternoon. Some gentlemen I could not answer. Unfortunately, in my branch of the service we were not trained in the defense of gas attacks. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, this proposition is entirely in keeping with our obligations and the ideals which we told our boys we were fighting for. It has nothing to do with Bolshevism; it is not going to destroy Bolshevism. It is not charity, and, if it is a charity, gentlemen, it is entirely unbecoming to the American people to give charity with as much grudging as you are going to give this money. [Applause.]

Every military authority will agree with me that Germany could not have been beaten had we not first destroyed Austria-Hungary. Austria-Hungary was destroyed and the surrender of Germany followed. Credit is due to the Italian Army for the destruction and defeat of the Austro-Hungarian Army. But, gentlemen, what did more than anything else to disrupt Austria-Hungary internally was the President's 14-points peace message. [Applause.] We took that message, translated it into 14 languages, and delivered it by the ton in the Austrian territory. The Austrians feared that message more than they did our bombs, because they served notice that any aviator captured distributing pamphlets of that nature would be immediately hung.

The gentleman from New York, my colleague, Mr. SNELL, says that he wants some scrutiny here. I will tell the gentleman that we will have the scrutiny of the whole world; our representatives will have to make good; the \$100,000,000 of food must be judiciously apportioned—to place it where it belongs—or we will hear about it.

I appeared before the representatives of the Jugo-Slav conference at a gathering in Rome, not as a representative of this House, not as an American soldier, but as an American citizen, and I told them in April that if they could break loose from the Hapsburg yoke, if they could establish a government that we could trust, that we would help them. I told them that we were eager to assist the oppressed people of the world. Now, did we mean it then or are we going to renig now?

Did we not war against the central powers because we believed that it was our duty to take a decisive stand with the civilized nations of the world? Let us for a moment read the closing words of the great war message of April 2, 1917.

The President said, in closing:

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be, many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as

shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes, everything that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.

Those are the principles for which we fought, and now that we have won the war we must make good and see these unfortunate people at least started on the right path to self-government. We did not intend to liberate them from Hapsburg or Hohenzollern oppression and then stand idly by and permit them to starve.

Now, this food is necessary. The remark was made that the allies ought to do their part. When Italy had not sufficient food for herself, for her own people, she sent food to feed the Serbian Army. I say that in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]; and a pound of bread meant more to Italy in those dark days than a thousand tons means to us to-day. The remarks from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON], although he is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, show that he is not at all familiar with the military activities on the Austrian front.

Gentlemen, let us be frank. So much has been said about the allies doing their share. In answer to that I say that the allies did more than their share for three long years fighting Germany while Germany was sinking our boats, murdering our citizens, and we were making up our minds what to do. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] said that we are going to give something to the Czecho-Slovaks, "a nation on paper." I will say to the gentleman that that "nation on paper" had an army in the field fighting long before our Army was in the field, that when the Russian Army broke entirely it was the Czecho-Slovaks that held the line. I say to the gentleman that regiments and companies of Czecho-Slovaks surrendered to the Italians and refused to go to the rear, but turned around and fought against the Austrians. They would not go to the rear lines until they demonstrated that they surrendered for the purpose of fighting the Hapsburg Army. At one time 300 of them were captured and hanged immediately. The Czecho-Slovaks have earned every bit of liberty that they are going to enjoy. We can not do too much for them. The gentleman also says that the war is now over, that it is not necessary to vote this money under the duress of war. I am glad we are in a position to vote this money, now that hostilities have ceased, in keeping with our obligation and the principles we told the world we were fighting for, without duress. Let the world know that this is the free will of the representatives of the American people. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] says that we should act on judgment and not on emotions. I will say to the gentleman, who has had some experience in preaching, that I would refer him to Bernard Shaw's Major Barbara. "You can not talk religion to a man with hunger in his eyes." And likewise you can not preach self-government and liberty to people in a starving land.

There seems to be doubt as to the necessity of this food being so urgently needed. Everyone rejoiced when the news was flashed, shortly after the defeat of the Austrian Army, that the Jugo-Slavs had agreed among themselves to establish a government embracing and uniting all of the Slav countries of the Balkans. The word "Jugo" means southern and nothing else. I say this because some Member might still be under the impression, like the friend of Mr. Dooley, that it is some sort "of canned meat." The population of Bosnia and Herzegovina according to the last census is about 1,898,000; Croatia and Slavonia has 2,600,000; Serbia about 3,000,000; Montenegro, 436,789; Dalmatia, about 650,000. These Provinces would constitute the greater part of the Jugo-Slav confederacy, about ten or twelve million people in all. Besides this, there is the city of Fiume, with about 50,000, and Trieste and Istria, with 940,000. It is safe to say that in not one of these Provinces is there any supply of food. There is no crop in Serbia, absolutely none in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the crop in Istria and Dalmatia is very meager and limited. These are some of the people that must be fed immediately. I do not believe it is necessary to give you figures of the Czecho-Slovak Provinces and Poland, for no doubt you are quite familiar with them and conditions there. This bill is certain of passage, and I urge my friends of this House not to attach any strings to it or do anything which might embarrass our representatives at the peace conference. England will certainly do her full share in this vast undertaking of assisting our allies or new friends of newly formed governments. England has always responded with her full quota, be it men, money, or food, whenever required. France and Italy will surely do everything within the limits of their resources to cooperate with us. Let us put all of our heart in this

measure, and let us lend, or give if necessary, willingly and cheerfully. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, the hour is late and we have listened to a great many arguments both for and against this proposition during the day. I presume gentlemen who are here are anxious to reach a vote and that further arguments will not have much weight. We have heard a great many arguments here why this appropriation should be made, but we have not been given a single reason. We have not had a single fact that can justify action. I voted for the war; I voted for everything connected with the war; and I have done, in common with other Americans, everything that is necessary to bring about victory. The President of the United States on the 2d day of December said that the war is over and we are at peace with the world. The Chief of Staff and the Secretary of War say that the Army is being demobilized; that 1,150,000 of our soldiers have been ordered discharged; that we are discharging them at the rate of 30,000 a day. Fleets of ships are coming in carrying wounded soldiers from the other side and discharged men. Moneys are being expended out of the Treasury of the United States in fabulous sums. Taxes are being levied upon the American people as they never have been levied before. These taxes will continue for the next generation, no matter what we may do now. The American people are looking forward to the time when relief will come to them. Hundreds of thousands of men will be coming back from the other side, out of employment, and they will be in a starving condition in many cases before they will find a job. We have starvation existing in some cases in America now. It is not long since that the people of the Southern States appealed to the Congress to help them when the price of cotton was so low that everybody was out of funds down there. We believed then that we were not justified in voting money from the Public Treasury for private use. In 1913 there were 4,000,000 men idle in America. The bread lines then, under the present administration, were longer than they ever had been before. Did anyone suggest that we appropriate \$100,000,000 to feed America's starving men that were standing in the bread line at that time? Will anyone appeal to the Treasury of the United States to feed them now, if necessary? I doubt it. We have been told that at the request of President Roosevelt we voted an appropriation of \$800,000 for the relief of the Italians on account of the earthquake at Messina. Yes, we did; we voted \$800,000 that they might be fed and cared for medically and surgically, but we were told specifically what the money was to be used for. We knew the facts in the case. An earthquake had swept these people into death and ruin and starvation. They were unable to relieve their own distress. The people for whom we propose now to appropriate this money could earn the bread which they need if they would but quit fighting among themselves and go to work. The more we feed them the less they will work. The American people are not willing that they should be taxed for the purpose for which this appropriation is asked. At any rate, they are not willing that we should appropriate \$100,000,000 of their money until we know that the countries beside whom we fought are willing to contribute their share in cooperation with us.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MADDEN. I have not the time to yield. If they are willing to contribute their share of the fund, if they will agree to do that among the peace commissioners of which the President of the United States is one, and he will send word to the Congress of the United States that in common with the allied nations he wants America to contribute its share to any charity which the world deems necessary and important, there will not be a man, woman, or child in America who will not say amen; but to say, without information, without facts, without knowledge, that we must be the only Nation to contribute to a fund like this is to say that we are willing to impose upon the American people to an extent unlimited. We have already spent \$25,000,000,000 of their money to win the war. We have yet many billions of dollars to pay. We are maintaining a great Army and a great Navy that will not be all demobilized for the next two years. We will call upon the American people soon for the payment of a \$6,000,000,000 tax. We will call upon them also for the purchase of \$6,000,000,000 more of liberty bonds. We will continue to tax them to the limit during more than the coming generation. We will find ourselves in the not far distant future in need of help for our own people, but notwithstanding that I would be willing to be one of 110,000,000 of people to contribute to the fund now sought as a citizen of America but I am not willing to cast my vote to take this \$100,000,000 out of the pockets of an already overtaxed people.

Let us appeal to the charity of America in its private capacity. They have already in the not far distant past contributed \$225,000,000 to the Red Cross for just the very purpose this \$100,000,000 is sought. Let us contribute \$200,000,000 more, if necessary, out of our private purses; but do not let us as the spokesmen of America prostitute the Treasury of the United States instead of giving of our private means to provide for any charitable necessities that may exist either in this country or anywhere else throughout the world. Stop it. The time is come when we must call a halt to this extravagant waste of public funds. Stop it or the people of America will soon stop you. Stop the extravagance. We have been going on and on in a headlong rush of extravagant waste until we do not know what we are doing, but the time is come to call a halt and this is the place to call it. Let the President of the United States formulate his plan in common with the allied nations with whom he sits and give the information that will justify action by the American people through their spokesmen in the American Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask permission to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all gentlemen who have spoken have that right.

The CHAIRMAN. That can not be done in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois who preceded me complained that we have not sufficient information and details as to the plan to be adopted in the distribution of food that will be purchased and as to the amount of expense that will be borne by our Government, and, really, that is the chief complaint made by gentlemen who oppose this resolution. It is, of course, very desirable to have all the information available when we vote upon any appropriation and particularly upon an appropriation of this magnitude. But we are 3,000 miles away and there is no opportunity for the Congress to get in touch with representatives of the allied powers. There is a great American now in Europe who is in touch with the allied powers and who has cabled to the Congress requesting this appropriation. While we talk here people are starving in Europe, and I for one am willing to trust the President of the United States, whom the people have trusted and do trust, to safeguard the interests of the American people and their Treasury. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] said that the United States Government was to be the great almoner of Europe. That I deny. I would not vote for a resolution which had for its purpose the financing solely by the United States Government of the whole project of feeding the starving in Europe, or even for paying the greater portion of that burden. It is true, as the gentleman from Kansas has stated, that the Governments of Europe are at the peace table asking for either territory or indemnity on account of the war and that our Government is the only great power which is not asking for an indemnity. We are asking only that a peace be agreed upon which will have as its chief corner stone the recognition of the rights of the people everywhere and which will be made as permanent as human endeavor can possibly make it. This fact, Mr. Chairman, does not absolve us from all obligation arising by reason of our participation in the war. But I deny that we are to do more than our fair share, along with the Governments of Great Britain, France, and Italy. We have the assurances of the peace commissioners and the representatives of the United States who are now in Europe that our Government will not be expected to shoulder the burden alone.

Cablegrams have been read here to the House, statements have been made as to the extent to which Great Britain and Italy are now furnishing food to the suffering and starving in Europe, and an interallied commission has been appointed to handle these funds. And it seems to me that sufficient evidence has been presented to the Congress that our Government is not expected and will not be required to bear anything more than a reasonable and proper proportion of the burden which rests upon our Government and the allied powers of Europe.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] has stated that nothing had been read from the hearings showing that this Government would not be expected to do more than bear its

just and fair proportion. I want to read from page 5 of the hearings the statement made by a representative of the Government who appeared before the committee in support of this appropriation.

Mr. GORDON. What was his name?

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Glasgow. He says:

The purpose of this appropriation, as we gather from the cables, is that England and France—Italy not yet having signified her ability to put up her proportion—have agreed to put up their proper proportion of the relief fund necessary to take care of the starving people throughout Europe, and, at the President's request, this \$100,000,000 would be America's contribution to the common fund. It is not the purpose to use any part of this fund for charitable contributions where there is a possibility that those starving people can by any means, by securities or by money, pay for it, but the purpose is to use it as a revolving fund for handling the situation so far as possible, but in certain isolated cases where it is impossible to get payment at once it is to be used to relieve the starvation and anarchy.

That, Mr. Chairman, is about the situation.

The assurance we get is that England and France will pay their proportion. Mr. Rickard, who is thoroughly familiar with the Belgian relief work, informs me that in the Belgian relief work, which has been carried on with remarkable success throughout its entire career, England and France contributed to that relief just twice what America contributed. That is the only guide we have as to what may be the proportions in which the contributions will be made.

The President tells us that this appropriation is necessary as our part of a fund to relieve the starving and put down anarchy in certain sections of Europe in order that where anarchy now prevails stable governments may be formed which are capable of entering into terms of permanent peace. I am not willing by my vote to help to paralyze the arm or handicap in any way our great President, who is now in Europe in the endeavor to carry out the wishes of the American people and to write a peace treaty which will save future generations from the terrible experiences of the past four years which have drenched the whole world with blood.

Say what you please, the American people are behind Woodrow Wilson. They have bidden him godspeed in his efforts. The heart of every father and mother, every soldier, every son and daughter, beats in sympathy with his efforts to bring about a permanent peace league. Do not delude yourselves with the idea that the people will look with patience upon the action of any party or any individual who throws an obstacle in his path, as the defeat of this resolution would do. The people would rather pay many times this appropriation and secure a quick and permanent peace and the early return of our boys than to have no appropriation made and see hostilities resumed or be threatened with another war in the early years to come. Do not by the defeat of this resolution make it possible for the President's opponents to detract from his great prestige in the allied countries by saying that he has not the support of the representatives of the American people, whom he is trying to serve and who are earnestly supporting him.

Mr. Chairman, I support this resolution because I regard it as distinctly a war measure. It is intimately connected with and grows out of the great war in which we have been engaged and which we have won. I will vote for it because I regard it as an obligation to the world which rests upon the United States Government and the allied powers in Europe on account of the great war. And certainly no true American would desire to see his country, rich, proud, powerful, and resourceful as it is, fail to measure up to the full obligation and responsibility resting upon it. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the reading of the bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the bill be read for amendment, and then the gentleman can offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Be it enacted, That for the participation by the Government of the United States in the furnishing of foodstuffs and other urgent supplies, and for the transportation, distribution, and administration thereof to such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President from time to time as necessary, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, in the discretion of the President, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$100,000,000, which may be used as a revolving fund until June 30, 1919, and which shall be audited, where practicable, in the same manner as other expenditures of the Government are audited: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be reimbursed, so far as possible, by the governments or subdivisions thereof or the peoples to whom relief is furnished: *Provided further*, That a report of the receipts and expenditures under this appropriation shall be submitted to Congress not later than the first day of the next regular session.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Page 1, line 4, after the word "States," insert the words "in conjunction with the allies engaged in the war against the Imperial German Government."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of this bill, but if the bill is to pass I believe it should be amended and certain limitations should be put upon the expenditures, and that we should also insist that our allies should bear a fair proportion of this expense. I am not satisfied that the United States is getting that square deal in this war business to which it is entitled. I am not satisfied that our diplomacy up to date has been so wholly in the interest of the United States as it should have been. I am not satisfied that we are safeguarding our trade routes as they should be safeguarded. Every time a foreign nation desires to regard us as an "easy" people we seem "to fall for it." If it is money, we furnish the money; if it is men, we furnish the men; or, if distress prevails, then comes an appeal for charity and we help. All this time we ignore the fact that there are thousands at home, within our own jurisdiction, who knock at our door in vain for the encouragement Congress withholds. Bills remain upon the calendar for the relief of individuals and concerns in the United States until the parties in interest are dead, and we take no action. Appeals come up from the wives and children of our soldiers, now policing these foreign lands, and all we do is complain and find fault with the administrative officers. We take no hurried action to see that justice is done to our own people. Business men contend, owing to the increase in bureaus and the appropriations necessary for their maintenance, that they are hamstrung and limited in their trade affairs. We are told by them that the increase in the cost of living is due to the fact that we have been placing too much confidence in bureaucratic chiefs, like the gentleman who is now upon the other side of the water making arrangements to dispense American charity in foreign nations—

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Now, I have no objection, so far as I am concerned, as to Italy, France, Great Britain, and several other countries, Cuba—for instance—but if we are going to consult all those the people will be dead and buried on the other side that we want to help. I say that in the hope that the gentleman will amend his proposition.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is older than I am, and holds a most respected place in this House. I am going to ask him if he has not heard these cries for relief coming up from the Far East ever since he has been a Member?

Mr. CANNON. That is foreign to the subject. We have been in this war, and are still in the war.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am asking the gentleman if he has not heard, from the time he began his service in this House, these cries for relief from the Far East?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, yes; and from the West as well as the East. We are committed to China, and we have done a lot of things.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman prevails in this, we would involve ourselves in these matters in Europe until we are compelled to add \$100,000,000 and another \$100,000,000, even until the people of the United States bleed. There is distress amongst our own people here just as there is amongst these restless people abroad.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman's amendment is the only suggestion in the way of real legislation that would involve us with foreign Governments.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am trying to put the foreign nations on the plane of good faith with the United States, and I will tell the gentleman why: Have we tried to do business in South America recently? Yes; we have, and our War Trade Board, in conjunction with the British officials, have restricted the space on which we may go into the markets of the world. We have been held up at every point. While they are busy capturing trade, our food prices are going up. While they are providing food for others we are forcing our own food prices so high—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given five minutes more. He has not had a chance to speak in general debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall not object in this instance, but in order that it may not in the future carry any personal phase to it, I shall object to undue extensions under the five-minute

rule. I think the House wants to vote on the amendments as offered and finish the business.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman object in this instance?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not object in this instance, but in order that in the future it may not carry any personal phase, I announced that I shall object to undue extensions hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for withholding his objection for the present. When the gentleman, who is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, was on the floor I endeavored to ask him a question. He was interested in his subject and could not at that time accord me an answer. I wanted to ask him then how much money had been spent of the first \$100,000,000 we turned over to the discretion of the President for such use as he saw fit during this war. I wanted to ask him how much money Mr. Hoover, the Food Administrator, had spent since the President appointed him to that high charge. I wanted to know whether at the present time the funds of the United States, whether of the President's \$100,000,000 fund or not, were going into these foreign countries for the relief of these people, and I wanted to know whether it was an afterthought or whether it was due to the ostentatious reception given to our representatives on the other side, that the thought had come to them that they were to play Kris Kingle to the people of Europe? [Applause.]

I was wondering, then, if the gentleman would answer me as to the amount of taxes we are obliged to levy upon the people of the United States. The gentleman is on the Committee on Appropriations, which spends our money; I am on the Committee on Ways and Means, which raises it. This morning I was unable to participate in the debate, because in conference we were deliberating upon the methods of imposing an additional burden of taxation that may run up to \$8,000,000,000, which the people of the United States will have to pay. The burden is heavy, and now that war profits are no more, we were proposing to distribute that taxation, to take it not only from the profiteers but to spread it all over the country. We must make the farmer pay and the industrial worker. All along the line they must bear the expense of this war. We were considering these things. I wanted to know whether these \$100,000,000 funds, which were new in this country three years ago, and which seemed to be enormous when we began them, are being properly expended, and it made no difference to me whether they were being expended by the President of the United States, by Mr. Hoover, or bureau chiefs down along the line. The money thus spent must be paid by the people of the United States, who are not aware, I am sure, that their Congress is endeavoring to make them, by the passage of this bill, the almoners of the entire earth. [Applause.]

I have seen widows, I have seen wives of soldiers in distress here. I have seen children clinging to the breasts of their mothers in the United States. You do not have to carry me over to Armenia for pictures of misery and distress. I have seen American collectors on the streets begging for Armenians, when American women, passing by with children clinging to them, have asked, "If this money goes to Armenia what will become of us?" We have plenty of pitiful stories right here at home.

I have here the evidence of the tax that the American soldier boys have been paying upon the ships of foreign nations carrying them abroad for a price, to protect the people over there. I have evidence of the commissary established by money makers on these ships, taxing our boys out of the paltry wages we are paying them to lay down their lives on the other side. I have some evidence of the taxes that are levied upon the expenditures of our soldiers on the other side. They pay heavily for everything they buy and some of them come back penniless. I know that every claim that is set up against us over there for aiding in the establishment of "democracy throughout the world" has been made a matter of record, and that we are paying lavishly for every damage done, and knowing all this I thought the gentleman from Kentucky might be able, when I asked him the question, to tell us something about it. I think we might well be informed whether we are throwing this \$100,000,000 away for the gratification of a few individuals who want to be philanthropic and generous with other people's money, or whether it is an attempt on the part of somebody "to put something over on us." I wanted to know whether somebody, national or individual, was trying to unfairly involve the United States, and I think the time has come for us to find out. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves to amend the amendment offered by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania by adding after the word "allies" the words "Great Britain, France, and Italy," so that the amendment will read:

"Page 1, line 4, after the word 'States,' insert the words 'in conjunction with the allies, Great Britain, France, and Italy engaged in the war against the Imperial German Government.'"

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment to perfect the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Without that amendment the gentleman's amendment would kill the object of the bill if it was adopted. The Central American States, Cuba, and many other nations, have allied themselves with us in this war.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will accept the gentleman's amendment if it is confined to France, Italy, and Great Britain.

Mr. CANNON. Very well, the gentleman modifies his amendment, and I want to ask him now, with that amendment, is he willing to support the bill?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am frank to say that I will not support it, because I think the precedent would be a very bad one, indeed.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is my personal and political friend, and I would not say anything to hurt his feelings, but I must be true to my own views. I must be reconciled to myself and perform my duty as I see it. The gentleman in his remarks has spoken about starvation in the United States, about women with children asking alms. I am here to say that, so far as I am informed and believe, here in the United States we are organized to relieve those who are not able to relieve themselves, and we are quite as well off in that respect now as we have ever been in the United States. [Applause.] In my own city, and in every other city, township, and county, thank God, we are organized to give relief to distress. Sometimes the people who ask relief are not candid. Sometimes relief is given, even by residents of the United States, where the people relieved might support themselves by industry. We are no worse off in that respect than we were before this war was declared. [Applause.]

I want to say one other thing, and I must insist upon it. The gentleman says the war is over. Somebody has said that Woodrow Wilson, the President of the United States, has said that the war is over. What he said was, "So the war comes to an end." But he did not mean it when he said it, because the war can not be over until peace is made. Now, how is peace to be made between the warring powers? Our principal enemies are Germany and Austria. In the beginning Russia was one of our allies. No other countries except the three that I have mentioned, Great Britain, France, and Italy, joined with us can give assurances that the terms of peace will be enforced, because the other countries have not organized governments. I pray God that the Czecho-Slovaks and the Jugo-Slavs and Serbia and Roumania may come in, but there is a proposal in the newspapers that Germany shall be taxed \$40,000,000,000. Is there any government in Germany to assent to such a tax? Why, in the Far East Bolshevism is universal and progressing in Germany.

I am not afraid of this \$100,000,000 being misappropriated. The gentleman says, and other gentlemen have said, "Oh, it is the entering wedge." Good God, you can not make any appropriation in this Congress that will be an entering wedge, that will bind any future Congress. After the 4th of March the next Congress will be here, either in extra session or in regular session later on. I hope we will not be sidetracked with embarrassing amendments and that we will get a vote upon this bill to-night.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I very much deplore the lack of information which we have from the President in regard to this appropriation. It seems to me that Congress might have been taken somewhat further into the confidence of the President regarding the needs of the appropriation and proposed application of the money. But I regard this proposition as purely something which grows out of and is a part of the war. The peoples who will be benefited by this appropriation are those who have joined with us, or we have joined with them, in making war. And because of the war there is the shortage of food supplies there. If our Army were in the Balkans, with starving people on every side, we would criticize the Army if it did not give to the starving people a portion of the rations which we had furnished to the Army. And while I deplore the lack of information given to us by the President, I do not feel disposed to punish the starving people of southeastern Europe because of any failure of the President to give the information. [Applause.]

We know enough about what has taken place in Europe to believe that there is a shortage of food there, that there is dan-

ger of starvation there because of the war, and when we believe that there is the danger of starvation there, that peoples are starving for lack of food, I think it would be proper for us, as a part of the war expense, to help feed them until peace comes to them in their own localities. [Applause.]

Of course, I hope and believe that the expenditures of any money by this country there will be joined with expenditures by Great Britain and France. I have no doubt that will be the case. I do not think that we ought to hesitate to give the money now, so that it can be used as soon as possible. Before we could acquire the information, if we waited, these people will have passed beyond. Their government will still be disorganized and anarchy will still prevail. It is to our interest as a country to establish not merely the forms of government there early, but to establish real peace there. I do not believe that all the troops from the United States will be returned to-morrow. There is danger over there yet, and we would not be willing then to have the danger show up and send our troops back, but if we can establish a stable government in the Balkans and southeastern Europe we then can safely bring home our boys from Europe. We ought to establish a stable government in Germany. I had hoped that our troops would march into Berlin and establish a government there. That ought to have been done, but we ought now to see to it that as soon as possible a stable form of government is established in those countries and that our troops may return to peaceful pursuits at home. [Applause.]

For these reasons I shall support the bill, because I do not believe we ought to take the responsibility on our side of turning down the first request the President has made in connection with the peace table, when the danger of starvation threatens these people if we refuse the request. If it was a matter of punishing the President I might join in the punishment. I am not willing to punish other people because of the failure of the President to properly perform his duty in giving information to Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, during the debate some of the gentlemen who have spoken seemed almost to doubt the urgency of the situation over there. As I listened to these gentlemen I was reminded of a meeting that I attended in this city one Sunday afternoon three years ago, at the home of Miss Boardman, then and now the head of the local Red Cross. About 100 members of the Senate and the House were present, together with a number of the residents of this city.

We were invited to hear a Mr. Wolcott, then recently returned from Europe, where he had been prominently connected with the American Red Cross, describe what he saw in Poland. It was a vivid recital. I have time to mention only two or three of the many incidents of which he told us, and which he said were typical of countless thousands in Poland alone.

In company with an officer he was one day walking along the street during a snowstorm when he noticed, near the walk, a little mound of snow. Pushing his cane down into it they found a boy about 7 or 8 years of age, unconscious, with the emaciated arms and legs, the swollen stomach, and the bulging eyes of those who suffer from starvation. They carried him to a house and he revived sufficiently to tell them that he had had nothing to eat for two days; that two days before he had had a crust of bread, and that was all, and he died—starved to death.

The speaker threw on a screen pictures he had taken for the Red Cross in Poland. One was of a long, low, white structure in front of which were seated a number of persons. Among these was one to whom he directed especial attention, saying she was an anemic woman whom he at first thought must die of hunger, but whom they succeeded in saving. In the building back of her, when the picture was taken, were more than 100 men lying on the floor, of whom more than 100 died of starvation, and among them was her husband. This woman had lost her husband and six children in 12 days from starvation.

Gentlemen who doubt the urgency of the situation should remember that these incidents occurred three years ago, and that conditions have steadily grown worse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the notice that I served sometime ago I feel constrained to object to an extension of time, though personally I should like to have the gentleman continue, but I must follow the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I should like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky whether he is going to accept this amendment?

Mr. SHERLEY. I expect to discuss the amendment and am prepared to discuss it at this time, but I realize that a number of gentlemen who had not spoken under general debate are desirous of speaking briefly now, and for that reason I have not claimed the floor.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not care for recognition to discuss anything except the amendment, and I really do not care for recognition to discuss that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I am ready to discuss the amendment now.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Very well.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say simply this touching the amendment: There is not, in my judgment, the slightest doubt of the fact that England, France, and Italy have agreed to cooperate with the United States, and that they will cooperate, and I have that statement, as I have repeatedly said to this House, from the cables that have been sent by our representatives in France to the State Department and transmitted to me. There are two objections, to my mind, to legislating it into this bill. The amendment as offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] would require cooperation and work on the part of all the allies. Manifestly that would not be a practical thing. In order to remedy that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] suggests three allies; but you get out of one dilemma only to get into another, because then you confine the activities to the four allies—England, France, Italy, and the United States. I submit in all candor, in good faith to this House, that the attempt by this language to narrow activities is a mistake. We are dealing in Europe with affairs of tremendous moment. I do not share at all the suspicions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania touching the good faith of our allies. I have not shared his suspicions in the past touching our allies, and I do not share them now. I do not think it is necessary to write in here the names of the different nations. I do not think it is becoming for this Nation to undertake to arrange the detail of cooperation with other nations upon the same terms that men might arrange a horse deal or participation by individual Members in connection with personal matters. The language of the bill provides for the participation by the Government of the United States in furnishing these various things. Let us be frank. You are not going to really safeguard your \$100,000,000 by that language, and all you do is to add what, in my judgment, is simply evidence of bad taste. I hope both amendments will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and for the information of the House, without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the Madden amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which the Clerk, without objection, will again report for the information of the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I had accepted the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. But the committee did not.

The CHAIRMAN. There was no unanimous consent given for its acceptance. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the Moore amendment. The question was taken; and the Chair announced the yeas had it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania) there were—yeas 42, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILLETT: Page 4, line 6, after the word "furnished" insert "and no part of said sum shall be expended until Great Britain, France, and Italy shall have agreed to contribute to the relief herein provided their fair share thereof as determined by the President in view of the interest and economic ability of said nations."

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take up the time of the committee, as I have already discussed this measure, but this amendment goes somewhat further than that offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. It simply provides that Great Britain, France, and Italy shall contribute fairly. Now, I do not agree with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] that it is at all a slight upon those nations for us to say that they ought to contribute their fair share, too. The gentleman, in fact, says the reason why we need not do this is that he is satisfied they will do it. Well, perhaps they will and perhaps they will not. They certainly will not do it unless they feel that it is necessary. They will not do it if our \$100,000,000 alone is enough. This may end the need or we may be entering into a very far-reaching support of those nations, and it seems to me it is but fair that the United States should say, "We are glad to contribute; we will contribute liberally, but you ought to contribute such an amount as your interests and your economic condition makes reasonable." I do not say what that is. I leave that in this amendment to be decided by the President of the United States. It seems to me that is a fair, reasonable, and proper limitation to be put on this bill. I believe it really carries out what is the view of every man in this House that the other nations ought to cooperate with us in this charity, and I do not believe that either of the other nations would conceive it was an insult for us to make our appropriation dependent upon their also contributing their fair amount. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. GILLETT) there were—yeas 55, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana and Mr. McCULLOCH rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOOD of Indiana: Page 1, lines 10 and 11, after the word "President," insert "and to be expended through the American Red Cross."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Just reserve it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make or reserve the point of order?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I make the point of order that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana desire to be heard?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I desire to be heard. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that it is germane—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will wait a minute—

Mr. MANN. It is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. May the amendment be again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, a member of the committee.

There was no objection.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I have made the point of order; I will reserve it.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will reserve it if the gentleman wants to speak to it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I insist that this amendment is germane. This money is to be expended through some agency. It has been repeatedly said here by the proponents of this measure that it is to be expended through this international food-supply organization of which Mr. Hoover is the head and appointed by the President.

Now, that being true, it is perfectly germane to change the agency and define what the agency is through which it shall be expended. I take it for granted that the majority of gentlemen here want to get the best possible results from this legislation. If it is for the purpose of relieving the distress throughout Europe, why not place it in the hands of that agency that is prepared and qualified to see that every dollar of it goes for the purposes for which we desire to expend it. Why should we be

taking and expending a large portion of it for the purpose of paying for cargoes of pork already over there and those that are on the way over there, directed, if you please, by this new agency? If it is to be expended for the relief of distressed Europe, place it in the hands of those men and women who have been relieving the distress of Europe since this war commenced, who are in the localities, if you please, where this distress is, and who get their information first hand, and who are not engaged constantly around banquet tables and know nothing of the facts except by hearsay. [Applause.]

The American people have responded, as no people on the face of the earth have ever responded, to charity, and to every war necessity. It is time that they were being informed now as to how the future expenditures are to be made. We will be going before the people presently asking for another loan of \$5,000,000,000; soon after that for another loan of \$5,000,000,000. The American people have a right to know, now that the war is over, and when they have a right to ask questions, how this money of theirs is being expended. There is no right in law for the expenditure of this money at all. And no man can maintain that there is, unless it be by the exigency of war—a war that the President has said in this House is ended.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman vote for the bill if his proposed amendment is adopted?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Absolutely. I will vote for it. I want to see that this money is expended for the purpose for which we are intending it. [Applause.] No one here doubts but what the Red Cross can expend this money better than any new agency that is now being organized over there. And no one doubts but what they have the information with reference to where this distress exists and where the relief can be best applied. Why should we then furnish a new overhead, with all the expenses necessary to that overhead, and put it in force so that it can expend this money?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know that the President has indorsed the plan of the American committee to raise \$30,000,000 to be expended in the Far East, and much of this money is collected and in the war chest now?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes. The papers are full of it. But I want to confine myself to the matter immediately before us. I take it that everyone here is acting in good faith in reference to this thing, and my only opposition to it before the committee and here is the medium through which this money is to be expended. My belief is that there will not be one-half of it that will go for the purposes we are voting it for if it is placed in the hands of this new agency. My belief, on the other hand, is that every dollar of it will go for the purposes we are voting it for if it is placed in the hands of the Red Cross. Who has heard of any money being diverted from their purposes by the Red Cross?

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. ROBBINS. I wish to suggest to the gentleman from Indiana that his amendment, which names the distributing agency as the "Red Cross" is incorrect. I read from chapter 23, session 3, of the Fifty-eighth Congress, which incorporates this organization, and I find the proper corporate name is the "American National Red Cross." It is important that the proper corporate name be given, if it is to perform this very important international charitable work.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will ask that it be changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that the amendment of the gentleman is not correct so far as it applies to lines 10 and 11. It applies to lines 9 and 10, and, without objection, the changes indicated by the Chair will be made. There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Would the gentleman have the official representatives of this Government in dealing with the official representatives of other Governments, deal with them through the medium of a private organization?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. What is the organization that has just been created over there but a number of citizens, two designated from this country, namely, Mr. Davis and Mr. Hoover? Two were designated by France, two were designated by England—a new combination, if you please. We ought not to quibble about the agency through which this money is to be spent. It is the result, I dare say, that we are all wanting, and if we want the best possible result, why not give it to that agency whose business it is to expend money in this way? [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and desire simply to say this in connection with the amendment offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is perfectly impracticable to adopt this amendment and to put into effect the cooperation which gentlemen on the other side, including the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood], have so greatly urged. I know nothing that warrants the belief that this money will not be properly expended by the President and by the representatives he has named upon this allied food commission, and I do know that the Red Cross has been dependent in the past, as it is to-day, for much of its information and much of its help in granting its relief to the allied food commissions that have existed and that do now exist. I hope the amendment will be defeated. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. MANN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if you write a letter up to the War Department to-day and ask the War Department in reference to some soldier in France who has been killed or wounded, some one, perhaps, who may be in a hospital, the distinguished gentlemen who run the War Department will refer you to the American Red Cross. [Applause.] They will tell you that they have to rely upon the American Red Cross for any information concerning any soldier boy of the Republic in a hospital in France. And it does seem to me that if the Army admits either its own incompetency or the utmost competency of the Red Cross in giving information concerning men in the service of the United States abroad, we might very properly use the machinery of the American Red Cross in distributing charity in Europe. [Applause and cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is presented upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana and Mr. SNYDER demanded a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is asked for. Those who favor the amendment will rise and remain standing. [After counting.] One hundred and one gentlemen have risen in the affirmative. Those opposed will rise and remain standing. [After counting.] One hundred and nineteen gentlemen have risen in opposition.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are asked for. Those who favor the taking of the vote by tellers will rise and be counted. [After counting.] Evidently a sufficient number have risen.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed Mr. SHERLEY and Mr. WOOD of Indiana to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 103, yeas 129.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote the yeas are 103 and the yeas are 129.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, we could not hear the announcement of the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The announcement of the vote was yeas 103, and yeas 129. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCULLOCH: Strike out in line 7 the words "the President" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "a commission, to consist of three members, one of which shall be appointed by the President, one of which shall be named by the Senate, and one by the House of Representatives; not more than two members of said commission shall be of the same political party."

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take more than a minute.

It has been admitted on both sides of the Chamber during the discussion that information in regard to how this fund is to be expended, where it is to go, and how it is to be administered, is very meager. The information received from the other side of the ocean is meager, and the information given the House by the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill has been exceedingly meager. I gathered from the newspaper report, to which I have already referred, just a portion of which I desire to call to the attention of the House now, something of what is to be done. In an article in the Evening Star on Saturday this paragraph appears:

The reason given by administration officials for not specifying more definitely to whom the food supplies are to go is that Mr. Hoover should be left free to meet changing conditions as the needs arise.

Now, I submit that on an appropriation of \$100,000,000, which comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers of America, it would be as little as we could do to add to the medium of distribution one Member from the House and one Member from the Senate.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want to see how we could work out practically the amendment proposed by the gentleman in the event that it should be adopted. The amendment provides for one member appointed by the President, one elected by the Senate, and one elected by the House.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Elected or appointed, either way.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The amendment provides "elected." And it provides that no more than two of them shall be members of the same political party. Now, how are we going to arrange about the election, in the event that the gentleman's amendment prevails? If the President appoints one and appoints a Democrat, and the Senate elects one and elects a Democrat, then would we have to elect a Republican? Or if the President appoints a Republican, and the Senate elects a Republican, then will the House have to elect a Democrat? What is the practical result?

Mr. McCULLOCH. It perhaps does seem somewhat impracticable to one so partisan as the gentleman, but it will be more practicable after the 4th of March. There would be no trouble about it then. Now, I believe that the impracticability suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee would remedy itself. The proposition I am trying to advance is just this, that it is our duty now to place some safeguard around the expenditure of this money, and that this appropriation would be accepted by the people in a better spirit if they know that there is a supervising committee consisting in part of the representatives of the people; and I can not see, if there is nothing to this except charity and good will and justice and equity, why everybody should not be willing to have proper safeguards around it. For my part I will gladly and willingly vote for this bill if this amendment, or the amendment which will probably be offered in a motion to recommit, is adopted. I think we ought to do something. We owe it to the taxpayers to put some safeguard around the expenditure of this money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I send up an amendment and ask that it be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized to offer an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LITTLE: Page 1, line 6, after the word "to," insert "the Armenians."

Mr. SHERLEY. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, the Armenians have waited a thousand years to get a little attention from Christendom, and I did not know but I would have to wait as long before I got a hearing here.

For a thousand years the Armenians have been ground between the upper and the lower millstone, and they have not been pulverized yet. That means that they must necessarily be a race of the utmost stamina and entitled to the utmost consideration, and I am asking you to give it to them to-day. You wish to be charitable and to do a Christian thing. The universal voice of mankind will tell you that no race in the world is as needy to-day as is Armenia. No other race has suffered so and is suffering as much.

If you wish to reward a deserving race, no other race has endured as much as this race has endured for the cause for which we stand. They put 160,000 men into this war, first with the Russian Army, and then in their own army when they held the Turks for months, and at last they put 8,000 men with Allenby's army when he broke the power of the Turks. They are deserving because they have shown that they have the recuperative and self-sustaining power that with a little aid now will make them a great and powerful and rich nation. They are the industrious and ambitious people of all that vast area between the Caspian and the Mediterranean. They are the artisans and farmers of that land and the business men of the whole Turkish Empire, the only race that has demonstrated the capacity to organize and develop a nation. They are the one people who entered this war in chains and emerged with a recognized republic of their own, won by their own arms, the little Republic of Ararat. This mighty Christian Republic of the Occident should not overlook the rights of the first Christian nation which 1,500 years ago raised the banner of a Christian civilization in the Orient.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LITTLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. As I understand it, Armenia is a part of Turkey in Asia?

Mr. LITTLE. It is the Christian part of Turkey. It lies right against the Caucasus. These people are of the same race and blood that we are. They just happened to land down there instead of in Europe.

Mr. CANNON. But this bill says Europe, and the Armenians are in Asia.

Mr. LITTLE. We do not undertake to take care of Europe. You will notice that this resolution says "the population of Europe," and these people are the same population and the same principle applies. The same reasoning applies. Turkey offered them more when this war began than our allies have as yet, but they cast their lot with us. They are Christians, they have suffered and endured for a thousand years, and they have shown a stability that entitles them to a chance to make their country great.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. LITTLE. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. I doubt the wisdom of adopting the language in the form in which the gentleman has suggested it.

Mr. LITTLE. I should be glad to have a suggestion.

Mr. SHERLEY. I just wanted to make a suggestion to the gentleman. It occurred to me that perhaps the situation could be reached if the language in the bill was made to read "such populations in Europe and countries contiguous thereto, outside of Germany." That would deal with the situation without specifying any particular country.

Mr. LITTLE. If I accept that, will the gentleman accept my amendment?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am willing to offer the amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. Then I am through, and I am much obliged.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment: After the word "Europe," in line 6, insert "and the countries contiguous thereto."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer that as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. SHERLEY. I think the gentleman from Kansas will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. I understand the gentleman from Kentucky to indicate that that would include all of Turkey.

Mr. SHERLEY. A part of Turkey is in Europe and a part of Turkey is out of Europe, and certainly that would be contiguous thereto.

Mr. LITTLE. I do not want any quibbling about it hereafter. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERLEY: Page 1, line 6, after the word "Europe," insert "and countries contiguous thereto."

The amendment was agreed to.

Leave to extend remarks in the Record was granted to the following Members: Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, Mr. CLARK of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHERLEY, Mr. SCHALL, Mr. HUDDLESTON, Mr. HERSEY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. ROBBINS, Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, Mr. BYENES of South Carolina, Mr. RUBEY, Mr. HUMPHREYS, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. GALLIVAN, Mr. OLIVER of Alabama, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. LUNN.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill and amendment to the House, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule which was adopted the committee rises automatically.

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill 13708, providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary, and had directed him to report the same back with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOOD of Indiana moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 1, line 10, after the word "President," insert "to be expended by the American National Red Cross."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 117, nays 202, answered "present" 3, not voting 108, as follows:

YEAS—117.

Anthony	Fairfield	Knutson	Rose
Baer	Fess	Kraus	Sanders, N. Y.
Bland, Ind.	Focht	La Follette	Schall
Blanton	Fordney	Little	Scott, Iowa
Bowers	Foss	Longworth	Sells
Browne	Frear	Lufkin	Sinnott
Browning	Fuller, Ill.	McArthur	Sloan
Burroughs	Gillett	McCulloch	Snell
Butler	Glynn	McKenzie	Snyder
Campbell, Kans.	Good	McLaughlin, Mich.	Steenerson
Cary	Goodall	McLaughlin, Pa.	Stiness
Chandler, N. Y.	Green, Iowa	Madden	Sweet
Chandler, Okla.	Greene, Mass.	Magee	Swift
Clark, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	Mann	Switzer
Classon	Hadley	Mason	Tilson
Cooper, W. Va.	Hamilton, Mich.	Miller, Wash.	Timberlake
Copley	Haskell	Moore, Pa.	Tinkham
Curry, Cal.	Haugen	Moore, Ind.	Towner
Dale	Hawley	Morgan	Treadway
Dallinger	Hayes	Mott	Vestal
Darrow	Hersey	Mudd	Ward
Davis	Hicks	Nolan	Wheeler
Dempsey	Hollingsworth	Osborne	White, Me.
Denison	Hull, Iowa	Paige	Williams
Dillon	Johnson, Wash.	Purnell	Winslow
Dowell	Juhl	Ramseyer	Wood, Ind.
Dyer	Kelley, Mich.	Rankin	Woodyard
Elliott	Kennedy, Iowa.	Robbins	
Esch	King	Rodenberg	
Fairechild, B. L.	Kinkaid	Rogers	

NAYS—202.

Alexander	Dooling	LaGuardia	Saunders, Va.
Almon	Doolittle	Lampert	Scott, Mich.
Anderson	Doremus	Larsen	Scars
Aswell	Doughton	Lazaro	Shallenberger
Austin	Drukker	Lee, Cal.	Sherley
Ayres	Ellsworth	Lee, Ga.	Sherwood
Bankhead	Elston	Lever	Shouse
Beakes	Emerson	Linthicum	Sims
Bell	Eyans	Lobeck	Sisson
Benson	Farr	London	Small
Beshlin	Ferris	Loneragan	Smith, Idaho
Black	Fields	Lunn	Smith, C. B.
Blackmon	Fisher	McAndrews	Smith, T. F.
Bland, Va.	Flood	McKeown	Snook
Booher	Foster	McLemore	Stafford
Brodbeck	Freeman	Maher	Stegall
Buchanan	French	Mansfield	Stedman
Burnett	Gallagher	Mapes	Steele
Byrnes, S. C.	Gallivan	Martin	Stephens, Miss.
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gandy	Merritt	Stephens, Nebr.
Caldwell	Gard	Mondell	Stevenson
Campbell, Pa.	Garner	Moon	Sullivan
Cannon	Garrett, Tenn.	Nelson, A. P.	Summers
Cantrill	Garrett, Tex.	Nelson, J. M.	Tague
Caraway	Godwin, N. C.	Nichols, S. C.	Taylor, Ark.
Carew	Goodwin, Ark.	Nichols, Mich.	Temple
Carlin	Gordon	Oldfield	Thompson
Carter, Okla.	Gray, Ala.	Oliver, Ala.	Tillman
Church	Griffin	Olney	Van Dyke
Cleary	Hamlin	O'Shaunessy	Venable
Coady	Hardy	Overmyer	Vinson
Collier	Harrison, Va.	Overstreet	Voigt
Connally, Tex.	Hastings	Padgett	Voistread
Connelly, Kans.	Hayden	Parker, N. J.	Walsh
Cooper, Ohio	Heflin	Polk	Walton
Cooper, Wis.	Hensley	Pou	Watkins
Cramton	Holland	Quin	Watson, Va.
Crisp	Houston	Ragsdale	Weaver
Crosser	Huddleston	Rainey, H. T.	Weiling
Currie, Mich.	Hull, Tenn.	Rainey, J. W.	Welty
Davey	Humphreys	Raker	Wilson, Ill.
Decker	Igoe	Randall	Wilson, La.
Dent	Jacoway	Rayburn	Wilson, Tex.
Denton	James	Riordan	Wingo
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Romjue	Wise
Dickinson	Jones	Rucker	Wright
Dies	Kehoe	Sabath	Young, N. Dak.
Dill	Kelly, Pa.	Sanders, La.	Young, Tex.
Dixon	Kettner	Sanford	
Dominick	Kincheloe		
Donevan	Kitchin		

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Barnhart Harrison, Miss. Taylor, Colo.

NOT VOTING—108.

Ashbrook	Delaney	Graham, Ill.	Hutchinson
Bacharach	Dranc	Graham, Pa.	Ireland
Barkley	Dunn	Gray, N. J.	Johnson, S. Dak.
Birch	Dupré	Gregg	Kahn
Boland	Eagan	Griest	Kearns
Brand	Eagle	Hamill	Keating
Britten	Edmonds	Hamilton, N. Y.	Kennedy, R. I.
Brumbaugh	Essen	Henton	Key, Ohio
Candler, Miss.	Estopinal	Heintz	Kless, Pa.
Carter, Mass.	Fairechild, G. W.	Helm	Kreider
Clark, Fla.	Flynn	Helvering	Langley
Claypool	Francis	Hilliard	Lehbach
Costello	Fuller, Mass.	Hood	Leshner
Cox	Garland	Howard	Littlepage
Crago	Gould	Husted	Lundeen

McClintic	Parker, N. Y.	Rouse	Strong
McCormick	Peters	Rowe	Templeton
McFadden	Platt	Rowland	Thomau
McKinley	Porter	Russell	Vare
Mays	Powers	Sanders, Ind.	Waldow
Miller, Minn.	Pratt	Scully	Walker
Montague	Price	Shackleford	Wason
Morin	Ramsey	Siegel	Watson, Pa.
Neely	Reavis	Slayden	Webb
Norton	Reed	Slomp	White, Ohio
Oliver, N. Y.	Roberts	Smith, Mich.	Woods, Iowa
Park	Robinson	Sterling	Zihman

So the motion to recommit was rejected. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. PARK with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. McCLINTIC with Mr. ROWE.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay," and I desire to withdraw that and vote "present," as I am paired.

The name of Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi was called, and he answered "Present."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "nay."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote "present."

The name of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 73, answered "present" 1, not voting 114, as follows:

YEAS—242.

Alexander	Doughton	King	Ramseyer
Anderson	Drukker	Kinkaid	Randall
Aswell	Ellsworth	Kitchin	Rankin
Austin	Elston	LaGuardia	Rayburn
Ayres	Emerson	Lampert	Rogers
Barnhart	Esch	Larsen	Romjue
Beakes	Farr	Lazaro	Rose
Bell	Ferris	Lee, Cal.	Ruby
Benson	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Rucker
Beshlin	Fisher	Lever	Sabath
Black	Flood	Linthicum	Sanders, La.
Bland, Va.	Fordney	Little	Sanford
Blanton	Foss	Lobeck	Scott, Mich.
Booher	Foster	London	Sears
Brodbeck	Freeman	Loneragan	Shallenberger
Browning	French	Longworth	Sherley
Buchanan	Fuller, Ill.	Lufkin	Shouse
Burnett	Gallagher	Lunn	Sims
Burroughs	Gallivan	McAndrews	Sinnott
Byrnes, S. C.	Gandy	McCulloch	Small
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gard	McLemore	Smith, Idaho
Caldwell	Garner	Magee	Smith, C. B.
Campbell, Pa.	Garrett, Tenn.	Maher	Smith, T. F.
Cannon	Garrett, Tex.	Mann	Snook
Cantrill	Glynn	Mansfield	Stafford
Caraway	Godwin, N. C.	Mapes	Stegall
Carew	Goodwin, Ark.	Martin	Stedman
Carlin	Gray, Ala.	Merritt	Steele
Carter, Okla.	Greene, Vt.	Miller, Wash.	Stephens, Nebr.
Cary	Griffin	Mondell	Stevenson
Classon	Hadley	Moon	Stiness
Cleary	Hamilton, Mich.	Moores, Ind.	Sullivan
Coady	Hamlin	Morgan	Summers
Collier	Hardy	Mudd	Swift
Connally, Tex.	Harrison, Va.	Nelson, A. P.	Switzer
Connelly, Kans.	Haskell	Nelson, J. M.	Tague
Cooper, Ohio	Hastings	Nichols, Mich.	Taylor, Ark.
Cooper, Wis.	Hayden	Nolan	Taylor, Colo.
Cramton	Heflin	Oldfield	Temple
Crisp	Hensley	Oliver, Ala.	Thompson
Crosser	Hicks	Olney	Tillman
Currie, Mich.	Holland	Osborne	Tinkham
Dallinger	Houston	O'Shaunessy	Tinkham
Darrow	Huddleston	Overmyer	Treadway
Davey	Hull, Tenn.	Overstreet	Van Dyke
Decker	Humphreys	Padgett	Venable
Dempsey	Igoe	Paige	Vestal
Dent	Jacoway	Parker, N. J.	Vinson
Denton	James	Phelan	Voigt
Dewalt	Johnson, Ky.	Polk	Voistread
Dickinson	Jones	Porter	Walsh
Dies	Kehoe	Pou	Walton
Dill	Kelley, Mich.	Purnell	Watkins
Dixon	Kelly, Pa.	Quin	Watson, Va.
Dominick	Kettner	Ragsdale	Weaver
Donevan	Kincheloe	Rainey, H. T.	Weiling
		Rainey, J. W.	Welty
		Raker	Whaley

Wheeler	Wilson, Tex.	Wise	Young, Tex.
White, Me.	Wingo	Wright	
Wilson, La.	Winslow	Young, N. Dak.	

NAYS—73.

Almon	Dies	Hollingsworth	Schall
Anthony	Dominick	Hull, Iowa	Scott, Iowa
Baer	Dowell	Johnson, Wash.	Sells
Bankhead	Dyer	Kearns	Sherwood
Blackmon	Elliott	Kennedy, Iowa	Sisson
Bland, Ind.	Fairchild, B. L.	Knutson	Sloan
Bowers	Fairfield	Kraus	Snell
Browne	Fess	La Follette	Snyder
Butler	Focht	McArthur	Sweet
Campbell, Kans.	Frear	McKenzie	Timberlake
Chandler, N. Y.	Gillett	McKeown	Towner
Chandler, Okla.	Goodall	McLaughlin, Mich.	Ward
Clark, Pa.	Gordon	McLaughlin, Pa.	Williams
Cooper, W. Va.	Green, Iowa	Madden	Wilson, Ill.
Copley	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Pa.	Wood, Ind.
Curry, Cal.	Haugen	Mott	Woodyard
Dale	Hawley	Robbins	
Davis	Hayes	Rodenberg	
Denison	Hersey	Sanders, N. Y.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Harrison, Miss.
NOT VOTING—114.

Ashbrook	Fuller, Mass.	Leshner	Rouse
Bacharach	Garland	Littlepage	Rowe
Barkley	Good	Lundeen	Rowland
Birch	Gould	McClintic	Russell
Borland	Graham, Ill.	McCormick	Sanders, Ind.
Brand	Graham, Pa.	McFadden	Saunders, Va.
Britten	Gray, N. J.	McKinley	Scully
Brumbaugh	Gregg	Mason	Shackleford
Candler, Miss.	Griest	Mays	Siegel
Carter, Mass.	Hamill	Miller, Minn.	Slayden
Church	Hamilton, N. Y.	Montague	Slomp
Clark, Fla.	Heaton	Morin	Smith, Mich.
Claypool	Heintz	Neely	Steenerson
Costello	Helm	Nicholls, S. C.	Stephens, Miss.
Cox	Helvering	Norton	Sterling
Crago	Hilliard	Oliver, N. Y.	Strong
Delaney	Hood	Park	Templeton
Drane	Howard	Parker, N. Y.	Thomas
Dunn	Husted	Peters	Vare
Dupré	Hutchinson	Platt	Waldow
Eagan	Ireland	Powers	Walker
Eagle	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pratt	Wason
Edmonds	Kahn	Price	Watson, Pa.
Essen	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	Webb
Estopinal	Key, Ohio	Reavis	White, Ohio
Evans	Kiess, Pa.	Reed	Woods, Iowa
Fairchild, G. W.	Kreider	Riordan	Ziblmam
Flynn	Langley	Roberts	
Francis	Lehbach	Robinson	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. ROWE (for) with Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois (against).

Mr. VARE (for) with Mr. ROWLAND (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. GOULD.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. LEHLBACH.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. ROUSE with Mr. KAHN.

Mr. THOMAS with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. EAGLE with Mr. STEENERSON.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. BACHARACH.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. RAMSEY.

Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. MASON.

Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois, who is absent on account of illness, be permitted to extend his remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HASKELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. SIEGEL, of New York, is unavoidably detained on account of important business. If he were here he would have voted for this bill and likewise this morning would have voted against the motion to recommit and for the passage of the river and harbor bill.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WALSH. On what?

Mr. FARR. On this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is absent. He has asked me to state if he were here he would have voted against the motion to recommit the bill and vote for the final passage of the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. SHERLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky that he move to amend the title.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title be amended to conform with the text.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform with the text of the bill.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House adjourn.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, pending that, may I ask if it is the intention to call up the legislative bill to-morrow?

Mr. SHERLEY. It is my understanding it will be called up.

Mr. GARNER. Is it the purpose to move to adjourn until 11 to-morrow?

Mr. KITCHIN. Some gentlemen who have left said that if that request were made they would object, so we do not ask it.

Mr. WALSH. I shall object.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LANGLEY, for two days, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I renew my motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 14, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required for the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1680); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the executive officer of the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for expenses of dedicating the amphitheater and chapel (H. Doc. No. 1681); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a proposed paragraph of legislation authorizing a credit in the accounts of George W. Evans, chief disbursing clerk (H. Doc. No. 1682); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by Bureau of Fisheries for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1683); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1684); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Postmaster General submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Postal Service for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1685); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy submitting additional estimate of appropriation required by the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1686); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a tentative draft of a bill to prescribe the membership of boards of selection for promotion in the Naval Reserve Force (H. Doc. No. 1687); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Miss RANKIN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 3571) granting lands for school purposes in lots No. 111 in each of the town sites of Fort Shaw and Simms, Sun River reclamation project, Montana, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 914), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Revision of the Laws, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13304) authorizing the appointment of a commission to codify, revise, double index, and annotate all the laws of the United States of a permanent and general character, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 916), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12862) granting a pension to Nancy Robinson, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 14214) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Board of Commissioners of Ottawa County, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14215) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Board of Commissioners of Ottawa County, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14216) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Board of Commissioners of Lucas County, Ohio, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 14217) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hinckley, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14218) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Pecatonica, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14219) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Durand, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14220) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Rockton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 14221) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Northampton, Pa., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 14222) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to increase the monthly salaries of registers and receivers of local land offices; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 14223) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lancaster, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14224) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of York, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14225) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Camden, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14226) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cheraw, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14227) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gaffney, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14228) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chesterfield, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14229) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chester, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14230) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fort Mill, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14231) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kershaw, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14232) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rock Hill, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14233) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Winnsboro, State of South Carolina, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 14234) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Sherman, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14235) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Denison, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 14236) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Roosevelt, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14237) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Mineola, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14238) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the armory of the National Guard at Flushing, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14239) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Port Washington, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 14240) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of Red Bank, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14241) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of Perth Amboy, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14242) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of South Amboy, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14243) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of Toms River, Ocean County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14244) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of Long Branch, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14245) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of Asbury Park, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14246) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make certain donations of ordnance and cannon to the city of New Brunswick, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 14247) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Yates City, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14248) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kewanee, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14249) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orion, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14250) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Oneida, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 14251) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of La Farge, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD: A bill (H. R. 14252) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oneonta, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 14253) requiring The Adjutant General of the United States Army and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish certain data to the adjutants general of the several States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 14254) providing that the Secretary of War may turn over to the Postmaster General camp buildings and material suitable for the Postal Service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLASSON: A bill (H. R. 14255) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14256) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Antigo, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14257) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Crandon, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14258) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Appleton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14259) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Green Bay, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14260) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Kewaunee, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14261) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Marinette, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14262) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oconto, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14263) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Florence, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 14264) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sullivan, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14265) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Shelbyville, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14266) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mattoon, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14267) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Hale, Ala., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14268) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Sumter, Ala., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14269) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Tuscaloosa, Ala., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14270) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Greene, Ala., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14271) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Perry, Ala., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14272) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Bibb, Ala., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 14273) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Clinton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14274) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Monticello, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14275) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Decatur, Ill., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14276) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Homer, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14277) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Champaign, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14278) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Urbana, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14279) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charleston, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14280) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tuscola, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 14281) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fulton, N. Y., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14282) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oneida, N. Y., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14283) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Watertown, N. Y., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14284) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oswego, N. Y., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14285) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Lowville, N. Y., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14286) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to Colgate University at Hamilton, N. Y., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 14287) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Staunton, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14288) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Palmyra, Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BENSON: A bill (H. R. 14289) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Bel Air, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14290) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Westminster, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14291) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Board of County Commissioners of Baltimore County, Md., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SWIFT: A bill (H. R. 14292) to establish the American Academy of Government and Diplomacy; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14293) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, N. Y., for Bushwick and Highland Parks, cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages and suitable complements of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14294) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Borough of Queens, city of New York, N. Y., for Forest Park and Richmond Hill Library Square, cannons or fieldpieces, with carriages and suitable complements of projectiles; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 14295) to create an athletic commission and to legalize boxing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 14296) to donate to the borough of Atlantic Highlands, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14297) to donate to the borough of Barnegat City, Ocean County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14298) to donate to the borough of Spring Lake, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14299) to donate to the borough of Keyport, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14300) to donate to the borough of Highlands, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14301) to donate to the borough of Farmingdale, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14302) to donate to the borough of Englishtown, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14303) to donate to the borough of Deal, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14304) to donate to the borough of Bradley Beach, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14305) to donate to the borough of Belmar, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14306) to donate to the borough of Allentown, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14307) to donate to the borough of Allenhurst, Monmouth County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14308) to donate to the borough of Spottswood, Middlesex County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14309) to donate to the borough of South River, Middlesex County, N. J., a captured cannon or gun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 14310) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of St. Albans, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 14311) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Roosevelt, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14312) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Rumson, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14313) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Metuchen, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14314) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Seabright, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14315) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Milltown, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14316) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Tuckerton, Ocean County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14317) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Highland Park, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14318) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Bay Head, Ocean County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14319) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Dunellen, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14320) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Helmetta, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14321) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the borough of Jamesburg, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14322) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Lakewood, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14323) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Sayreville, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14324) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Eatontown, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14325) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Cranbury, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14326) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Matawan, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14327) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Woodbridge, Middlesex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14328) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the township of Shrewsbury, Monmouth County, N. J.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: A bill (H. R. 14329) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the village of East

Burke, Vt., for decorative purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 14330) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the American National Red Cross," approved January 5, 1905; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14331) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge in and for the western district of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 14332) to change the name of Sequoia National Park, Cal., to the Roosevelt National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 14333) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Little Falls, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14334) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Utica, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14335) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rome, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14336) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Waterville, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAMPERT: A bill (H. R. 14337) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Westfield, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14338) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chilton, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14339) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the village of Kiel, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14340) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Manitowoc, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14341) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Berlin, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14342) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ripon, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14343) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Neenah, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14344) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Menasha, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14345) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Oshkosh, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14346) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fond du Lac, Wis., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 14347) to provide for the payment of mileage to officers on joining their first stations when commissioned in the National Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 14348) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Salem, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14349) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Newburyport, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14350) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Gloucester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14351) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Salisbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14352) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Haverhill, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14353) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Topsfield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14354) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Beverly, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14355) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rowley, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14356) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of West Newbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14357) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Swampscott, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14358) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ipswich, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14359) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Manchester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14360) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Merrimac, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14361) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marblehead, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14362) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Newbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14363) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Georgetown, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14364) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Groveland, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14365) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hamilton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14366) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Danvers, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14367) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Essex, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14368) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Amesbury, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14369) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Rockport, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14370) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wenham, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: Resolution (H. Res. 501) providing for investigation and report by the Interstate Commerce Commission as to what the present methods are that are now being used in the purchase of railroad ties, switch ties, car material, and crossing plank; whether said methods are the most efficient; and as to whether there are any satisfactory substitutes now on the market for taking the place of the railroad ties, etc., now generally used and made of timber; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 384) providing for a joint committee to investigate all matters relating to mail and pay of soldiers in France; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BESHLIN: A bill (H. R. 14371) granting a pension to William J. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 14372) granting an increase of pension to Simpson Newman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 14373) granting a pension to Thomas B. Leeper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 14374) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Deuel; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 14375) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 14376) granting an increase of pension to Edward T. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of National League for Woman's Service in Wisconsin, asking support of the Lewis-Raker bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of American Federation of Labor, protesting against sections of the war-revenue bill relating to the zone sys-

tem and increase of postage on second-class mail; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions by the Industrial Commission of Wisconsin, indorsing the Smith-Bankhead bill for the rehabilitation of industrial cripples; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ELSTON: Resolution to be proposed by Hon. A. A. Wendering, California assemblyman, bespeaking action of Congress relative to naturalization of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions of board of education and city clubs and associations of Oakland, Cal., indorsing Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolutions of National Educational Association Commission on War Emergency, declaring approval of organizing youth of Nation for agricultural service; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolutions of the Industrial Commission of Wisconsin, indorsing the Smith-Bankhead bill for the rehabilitation of industrial cripples; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. DOOLING: Resolutions of National Automobile Chamber of Commerce of New York, petitioning Congress to increase appropriations to aid extension of export trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Federation of Federal Employees of Greater New York, requesting that the order directing a reduction in the civilian force at the navy yard, Brooklyn, N. Y., be withdrawn temporarily until members of enlisted personnel have been released; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Resolutions of the Tacoma Rotary Club, Tacoma, Wash., urging that aliens refusing to bear arms in defense of the United States be forever barred from the privileges of citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KETTNER: Letter from Hon. Lyman M. King, Redlands, Cal., relative to maintenance of zone rate of postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Anaheim and Fullerton, Cal., regarding House bill 13159 and Senate bill 5306, prohibiting amateur wireless operations; also, letter of George P. Bush, manager Santa Fe telegraph offices, San Diego, Cal.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, letters from Clarence W. Barton, El Centro; Eugene De Burn, chairman registration and selection military service, San Diego; R. O. Price, chairman local board No. 1, San Bernardino; and Charles C. Chapman, member of local board, Fullerton, all in the State of California, relative to recognition by Congress for part taken in war by selective-service boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions submitted by W. J. Capnel, recording secretary Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, San Bernardino, Cal., relative to Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolutions by the Teachers' Association of Oakland, Cal., indorsing Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 14, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, at the beginning of a new day we lift our hearts to Thee and seek to draw from Thee day by day grace and courage and wisdom and strength for the battle of life. As we face the tremendous issues that are upon us to-day we would not face them alone, but, as our fathers did, we would gain Thy guidance and blessing. So we come, we trust, in the spirit of our fathers and in their faith lift our hearts to the God of Nations, praying that Thou wilt indue us plenteously with heavenly gifts and guide us in the discharge of our duty. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SHEPPARD and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, and countries contiguous thereto, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.